This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

https://books.google.com

THE LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Periodical Collection
CLASS

BOOK

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE QUARTERLY

JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

"NOT THE WISDOM OF THIS WORLD."—1 COR. II. 6.

SCIANT IGITUR, QUI PROPHETAS NON INTELLIGUNT, NEC SCIRE DESIDERANT,
ASSERENTES SE TANTUM EVANGELIO ESSE CONTENTOS,
CHRISTI NESCIRE MYSTERIUM.

JEROME IN EP. AD EPH.

VOL. I.

LONDON:
JAMES NISBET AND CO., 21, BERNERS STREET.
1849.

Digitized by Google

"WITH the Lord's advent begins the real reign of God upon earth, a kingdom of righteousness, holiness, and peace, consisting of mortals, but with exemption from the Evil One and his enticements, and under a mighty influence of celestial power. It is called the reign of a thousand years, although it may endure more than a thousand years. Modern times have again paid attention to this near approach, thus coinciding with the ancient Fathers. It is resounding, as it were, a new call,—*The Lord cometh!* Among believers this doctrine, far removed from carnal conceptions, should no more be considered an error." —*J. F. Meyer*. (German.)

"Perhaps many readers will feel astonishment at the views we have already set forth respecting the last times; and put the question, if it be possible now to put forth such antiquated notions. What the Bible teaches never can become antiquated, notwithstanding all the doubts which may have been raised, and misconceptions respecting it. It may become, as it were, covered with dust, but cannot be considered antiquated. The truth only requires to be set forth in its biblical purity; it shines forth in its original clearness, and meets an accordance in every susceptible heart. On no subject of Christianity, perhaps, is this more the case than on that respecting the reign of a thousand years. It needs only to be considered in its true light; its inward light bursts forth, and on the ground of Christianity, it seems natural and necessary, as when contemplated by cultivated reason, it appears fair and elevated."—*Gess*. (German.)

"Cavendum est ne istiusmodi vaticinationes quae de prospero Ecclesiae visibilis statu in terris agunt, conemur spiritualiter explicare, quasi verba improprie sumenda sint, et, praeter gratiam Dei in Christo et spem vitae aeternae mentisque ad virtutem renovationem, nihil promissum sit; sed regnum Christi (ut vulgo dicitur), sit crucis regnum taleque per omnium seculorum decursum aeque manere, necesse sit."—*Crusii hypomnemata ad Theologiam Propheticam*. 1764.

Digitized by Google

205
Q28

PREFACE.

Few words will suffice to introduce this volume. Amid many anxieties and misgivings our first year's labours have been brought to a comfortable and successful close. For this we give all praise and thanks to a gracious God, who, notwithstanding the feebleness and foolishness of the instrument, has not only borne with us, and suffered us to go forward, but has helped and prospered and blessed us beyond our thought.

It was not for the sake of controversy that this Journal was projected; and we trust that it has not been carried on in the spirit of controversy, or in a manner fitted to exasperate or divide or distract. With disputed points, indeed, it has had, to a large extent, to deal. Nor could this be avoided. But controversy, in the usual import of the word, we have, as far as in us lay, sought constantly to shun. The things wherein we differ, we desire to make matters, not of controversy, but of conference,—not of contention, but of friendly inquiry; brother helping brother in their understanding of things to come, according to the measure of their light.

It was not to *theorize*, either on doctrine or on Scripture, that we undertook this work. Mere speculation we have sought to discountenance,—setting aside not only what is *disproved*, but what is *unproved*. It is, perhaps, in the field of *unproved* speculation that the largest licence has been taken, and the seeds of error sown most plentifully. For some prophetic theorists have occasionally ventured upon a bolder range, when feeling themselves standing midway between the *proved* and the *disproved*. Of certain of their opinions, they themselves will not affirm that they are *proved*. On the other hand, we cannot say that they are disproved. They stand simply among the *unproved*,—and

OCT 2 '38 (4 vols)

671743

Digitized by Google

thus give range to a fertile fancy. But surely a verdict of *unproved* is enough to hold speculation in check, in all those who desire to think simply as God thinks, and to know only as much of the future as He has seen good to reveal.

An objection has been taken to our Journal on the ground of its being necessarily a book of one subject, or, at least, one line of thought, and thereby fitted to injure or mislead by the prominence given to that one idea, or line of ideas. Our answer is twofold. (1.) This is done in every other department of knowledge, and done most successfully. We have a journal of agriculture, or a journal of chemistry, or a journal of the fine arts;—these, of course, restrict themselves to one department of knowledge, and their doing so is reckoned a benefit to science, and is acknowledged to be the true way of advancing the special study to which they are devoted. Why should men blame in the pursuit of prophetic truth what they praise in the prosecution of science? (2.) Our field is the whole revealed future, and that is a wide and varied one. With it before us we are not likely to be injured by devoting our Journal to the exclusive consideration of one class of inquiries, when that class is so large and comprehensive.

One object we keep in view is *to awaken inquiry.* In this we have not been unsuccessful. The circle of inquirers is widening every day,—interest is rising, prejudices are breaking down, and even the unwilling are compelled to listen. We do not mean to say that all this has been through us; but still our testimony has not been unblest. The increase of inquirers, especially in Scotland, during the last five years, is most cheering. Into every part of the land the tidings of the coming kingdom are making their way. Men are beginning to put anxious questions as to the Advent—its nearness, its suddenness, and its issues. They feel that these are matters which concern them most profoundly, and they are asking, "Is it possible that I can *watch* for an event, if I am assured it is not to take place for at least a thousand years?"

Digitized by Google

Another object kept in view by us has been to *help forward inquiry.* There is a large class to whom these subjects are not new. They have been searching for years. We seek to help them; and while we would unsparingly discourage crudities and rash imaginations, we would as earnestly endeavour to assist the inquiries and researches of those whose delight it is to meditate upon the law of their God, and upon whose consciences this question often presses itself, "Is it right for me to refuse to know anything that God has revealed? or can I expect to advance in meetness for the kingdom so long as I shrink from learning the details which God has laid before us concerning the nature and conditions of that kingdom?"

Another object has been to press home the proof of the pre-millennial Advent of the Lord, and to remove objections to this. These two things we mean to keep stedfastly in view, for the key to all prophecy is here, and many who are studying "things hoped for," are by no means firmly established in this point. It is strange to find many clinging to solitary objections, and because of these refusing to admit evidence however strong. In other matters we don't find it so. "The last thing (it has been remarked) a man would think of doing would be, to neglect the preponderant evidence on account of the residuum of insoluble objections; he does not allow his ignorance to control his knowledge, nor the evidence he has *not* got to destroy what he *has*, and the less so, that experience has taught him that in many cases such apparent difficulties have been cleared up in the course of time and by the progress of knowledge, and proved to be contradictions in appearances only; . . . it is much more easy to insist on individual objections, which no man can effectually answer, than it is to appreciate at once the *total effect* of many lines of argument and many sources of evidence all bearing on one point."*

* "It is easy to show," (says Butler, Anal., Part 2, ch. 7,) "in a short and lively manner, that such and such things are liable to objection, but impossible to show in like manner the united force of the whole argument in one view."

Digitized by Google

By dwelling on this proof in all its various forms and answering objections, we hope to show how impregnable is our main position; on what safe ground we stand; how direct and positive, as well as how overwhelming is our evidence; how indirect and negative, as well as how inconclusive is the reasoning of our opposers. Again and again have we adduced direct statements of the prophetic word which place the Advent before the kingdom; again and again have we asked our brethren to bring us one direct proof-text which places the kingdom before the Advent. We have received none. And thus the matter stands. It is of some importance that our readers should keep this in view.

In so far as the doctrine of the pre-millennial Advent is concerned, the matter cannot rest until the Church has been brought to see that the appearing must of necessity precede the kingdom; that it is not the kingdom that introduces the King, but the King that introduces the kingdom. With many this is a point so settled, that they are perhaps impatient that it should be ever treated as still needing argument and proof. But let them remember that by large sections of the Church, this subject has either never been heard of, or if heard of, keenly opposed and strongly condemned. In many places the question is only beginning to be stirred. But that it will be, ere long, awakened everywhere,—that it will force itself upon the attention of the saints of God throughout the world, we doubt not. It is doing so already. It will do so more widely. It will rouse the Churches. Events are compelling men to consider it however reluctantly. Nor will it rest till ended by the arrival of the King himself.

"Lord! open men's eyes to see and their ears to hear, that thy arrival may not overtake them unprepared, nor overwhelm them with shame and confusion of face; but that with eager hearts they may welcome Thee, and enter into thy joy!"

Digitized by Google

THE QUARTERLY

JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

OCTOBER, 1848.

Art. I.—OUR CONNEXION WITH THE FUTURE.

The world has awakened to the discovery that the *future* is its province as well as the present. It blunders grievously in its efforts to measure out and describe that province, but it hesitates not to lay claim to it as its rightful heritage. It says, — "that over which my being is to be spread belongs to me, and I must know it; that I have not yet traversed it, is no proof against its being my orbit, the course and curve of which is matter of profoundest concern to me;—my future is as truly mine as my past, and as full of interest."

Is the Church of Christ prohibited from reasoning thus? Is the future not hers? Is "the world to come" not her inheritance? Has she been left in the dark as to that future, — that inheritance? Far from it. The things to come are hers; and the things to come have been revealed. Her hopes are no dreams; her expectations no conjecture. She has certainty to build on,—certainty in which there can be no disappointment nor failure.

Indeed, the future is peculiarly *hers*. It belongs to her in a way such as it belongs to no one else. The links that fasten her to it are stronger and more numerous than those which connect her with the present. The things seen and temporal are not hers; but hers are the things that are unseen and eternal. She has left Egypt, and has become a wanderer in the hope of a promised kingdom. Her interest in the things present is a subordinate one,—the interest of the traveller, the pilgrim. Her interest in things to come is paramount; for there her hopes have their anchorage,

Digitized by Google

That coming kingdom is *all* to her. Her heart is there; her joys are there; her treasures are there. It is her *home*,—her home for eternity. Till she reach it she feels as an exile,—an outcast. Is it possible, then, that the little while of exile can occupy more of her thoughts than the everlasting kingdom of which she is the heir?

It is no fanaticism to live both *in* and *for* the future. It is *faith*, for "faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Unbelief would dwell in the present, faith leads us into the future. It displaces the visible, and brings forward the invisible. It lays hold of every thing that will open up more of the future. It prizes the prophetic word, as being its guide through that region to which it so specially lays claim as its proper portion and heritage. It treasures up every fragment of information given respecting days or ages to come, casting aside nothing, but pondering all; not shrinking from details or dates, in so far as these have been recorded by the Spirit of truth.

The moment that, in "believing the love which God hath to us," I became a member of the heavenly family, and an heir of the kingdom; that moment *the future* became especially mine. I was made to understand that the new state of being and of blessing into which I was thus introduced, was one whose centre was the future, not the present. Round that new centre I was henceforth to revolve. From that centre I was to survey and measure and judge of every thing. My relationship to the present was loosened—my relationship to the future drawn inconceivably closer. All that I possessed or hoped for was transferred to that future. I had been crucified with Christ; I had died with him; I had been buried with him; I was raised with him to sit in "heavenly places;" I had "come to Mount Zion, to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, the innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the first-born." Placed in such a position, what a value must I set upon the prophetic word which reveals that future with which I have thus become so mysteriously linked! It is the grace of a forgiving God that has brought rest to my soul, so that I know, of a certainty, that I shall never come into condemnation; but that very grace has led me "without the camp," and made me a stranger upon the earth. Yet in so doing it has put into my hands a lamp by which my stranger-steps shall be guided onward, and my pilgrim-eye gladdened, from day to day, with the vision of the glory to which I can now lay so assured and

Digitized by Google

so blessed a claim. To this I do well to take heed, "until the day dawn, and the day-star arise."

The prophetic word has been abused, and its study has proved the source of many a sad extravagance, says an objector. Be it so. Our duty, then, is, to be careful not to abuse it again, and to beware of allowing the study of it to generate such evils.

Besides, has it never occurred to such an objector, that *all* Scripture has been thus abused? Is it a new thing under the sun that truth should be corrupted? Nay, that the best truth should be the worst dealt with, and made the parent of the most outrageous error? Shall we therefore put aside all truth in mournful hopelessness as unattainable by man on earth? Shall we, for instance, risk our eternity by turning away from the Gospel,—from forgiveness through the sin-bearer,—because thousands have corrupted it, and thousands more denied it?

Nay, but farther, how can we reach truth in this fallen world, save through error? Error is natural to us,—truth is not. Error is the dark region in which we are born, and out of which we must pass, not without struggles and stumbles, into the bright plains of truth. Hence, we ought to count upon deviations, and even *extremes;* nor need we wonder even at *extravagances.* How few arrive at truth, save through extremes! They seem first to exhaust error, before they arrive at truth.

Let us, then, be thankful for past extremes—may we not say for extravagances? Their having occurred is a strong reason for expecting them not to return. They are finger-posts—warning lights; they show us the deflections that have taken place in other days; they have served their end; they have helped to humble man—they have helped to exhaust error. Our ground is now surer; our way less intricate; our steps are firmer. We must now be considerably nearer truth, if we have not wholly reached it. We see, at least, more clearly the direction in which it lies.

Should not such be our feeling in regard to the extravagances which are laid so heavily and often so complacently at the door of the readers of the prophetic word? There is no need of raising error, simply for the purpose of exhausting it. Nor is there any need to palliate the sinfulness of them who raise it. But when, in the wisdom of God, it has been allowed to rise, shall we not be thankful for the greater approximation to truth thus placed within our reach? It is something to learn where truth is *not:* even if they who give the information cannot tell us where it is.

Digitized by Google

We cannot help feeling that such is the position which we occupy in this Journal. The last twenty years have given birth to many a folly. To right and left the human mind has been diverging in its impatience for the discovery of truth, which seemed to it so near and so accessible. These deflections lie all before our view; the traces of them are not yet effaced. They have written their own record,—a record which any one may read who has access to what we may call the prophetical literature of that period. It is a record fitted to solemnize as well as to guide the inquirer. The wrecks of noble minds are there, over whom we could yet weep in the bitterness of our inmost souls.

The position in which we are placed, though a solemn one, has in it much of safety. The fragments of exploded error may seem but a crumbling foundation to stand upon, yet in truth they furnish most solid footing. We are much safer, than if standing upon level unbroken ground, on which no relic of an ancient error could be seen. And, we confess, it is this very position, which some would count perilous, that gives us confidence. The coast along which we are to steer has been in some measure sounded, and though this has been at the expense of some goodly vessels, still we feel that these stranded wrecks, or these beacons reared upon the sunken rock, are incalculably useful, and render our course less hazardous and difficult than it must otherwise have been. It still has its dangers; but these are at least fewer than they were.

Yet though now that these errors are but matters of history, we can look calmly upon them, we are not wholly free from fear. There is still among a certain class of minds such a lawless love of speculation, such a recklessness of exposition, that we cannot deem the danger entirely past. There is, too, such a love of novelty in interpretation, — such delight in innovation, that the evil must not be looked upon as a mere visionary alarm. "Prove all things," is a rule which some minds seem born to forget. A mere likelihood, however faint, a mere presumption, without one particle of direct and positive evidence, is often made sufficient to overthrow what is old, and to introduce what is new.

A friend was once maintaining with us that singular interpretation of the eleventh chapter of the Apocalypse, viz., that Enoch and Elijah are the two witnesses who are to prophesy in sackcloth, who are to be overcome and slain, whose dead bodies are to "lie in the street of the great city," "three days and a half." We asked him for *one*

Digitized by Google

solitary proof, or shred of a proof that such was the case. He had none to give, yet held fast the *unproved,* unscriptural opinion. We asked him, if he conceived that the glorified bodies of these saints who were translated, "that they should not see death," should yet be pierced and wounded, and they themselves put to death upon the earth after having been enjoying blessedness there three or four thousand years? His reply was, that he was not sure that Elijah had ascended or was glorified. Amazed, we asked for proof of such a statement. He opened his *Septuagint,* and showed us 2 Kings ii. 1, 11, where the words, "Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven," are translated ὡς εἰς τὸν οὐρανον, "*as* into heaven," telling us at the same time that he had far greater confidence in the Septuagint than in the Hebrew!

A work, not long since published, asserts that Napoleon is the eighth head and one of the seven. But finding part of the problem unsolved in Napoleon's past character and history, it maintains that he must rise from the dead, and in this resurrection-state fulfil the rest of his career. Where, however, is the proof of this? What passage of Scripture declares it? What *hint* of such a thing do the prophets give?

Another work, from a very different quarter, expounds, the seventeenth and eighteenth chapters of the Apocalypse, as to be fulfilled in *literal* Babylon, not Rome, or any presently existing city. Literal Babylon,—the Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar, is to be rebuilt in these last days,—rebuilt on the plain of Shinar,—rebuilt with greater splendour and compass and populousness, than in the days of old! We ask for proof, but there is none. We ask how a city built upon seven hills can be the same as a city in a plain? But we get no answer. Yet the fiction is clung to as part of revealed truth.*

* One error generates another. We find in some writers of the above class, some curious speculations as to the character of Antichrist. *He,* according to them, must be purely and thoroughly infidel,—the Scripture speaks of the evil of the last days of which he is the head and representative, as consisting specially in this, that it adheres to the form of godliness. *He,* according to them, must be entirely a secular personage, though Scripture presents him so often to us clothed in ecclesiastical raiment. He, according to them, must be some isolated individual of the last days standing up solitary among his fellow-men, disconnected with the wickedness of former days, though Scripture paints him as a growth from the roots of other ages,—one in kindred, in blood, in character, in actings with the Antichristian developments of successive generations,—for he "wears out the saints," and in him is found the blood of all the saints from the beginning. Adopting these views, they have been led to palliate or apologize for the enormities of Popery,—to deny the resemblance between Popery and Antichrist, and to heap calumnies on Protestantism, as if it were as thoroughly Antichristian as Popery itself.

Digitized by Google

It is here that the danger lies. These fictions, these conjectures, these *unproved* averments are dogmatically put forth for our credence; and if we do not receive them, or if we ask for proof, we are pitied as babes in the study, who have yet to learn the first principles of the prophetic oracles. Yet, at the risk of becomimg objects of such *pity*, we are resolved, in the strength of the Lord, to reject and resist to the utmost all such *unproved* statements. We shall make no compromise with them. Where *proof* is offered, we shall gladly consider any interpretation or idea, though new. Where *proof* is not presented, we must refuse to listen to it. We feel that we are bound, out of regard to the honour of the Scriptures, out of regard to the well-being of the Church of Christ, to give no countenance to the *unproved* assertions that are afloat amongst some expositors of the word. We wish this to be fully and unambiguously understood at the very outset by all our readers and contributors. We feel sorely indignant at the way in which Scripture has been tampered with, in order to prop up the crudities of a reckless fancy; and no less so at the way in which these crudities have been palmed upon the Church as verities, with hardly an attempt to demonstrate them from Scripture.

But dismissing this point, we return to the truth with which we set out, viz., our connexion with the future.

We have seen how close that connexion is and must be in any condition in which a saint can be placed. But the link seems to gather strength as the ages pass away and the last time draws on. The future, with all in it of dark and bright, seems more truly our dwelling-place, in these days when the whole earth is vibrating under the stunning weight of blows that are breaking her to pieces in every part. For, manifestly we have entered on a new era of dissolution and disintegration. In what is the present process to terminate? is a question which no man can now help putting, but which few seem prepared to answer with certainty or decision.

The world is in motion everywhere: yet it is the motion of fever, not the healthy action of the frame. It is the tossing to and fro of the sick bed, when the pulse has risen and delirium is working in the brain and giving wildness to the eye.

Poison is acting fiercely upon the system and deranging all its regularities. Or,—to use another figure,—the leaven is now thoroughly doing its work; it is shooting through the mass, and the whole is now leavened,—leavened for evil, not for good. These earthquakes, shivering thrones, are but at their

Digitized by Google

first heave or throe. These tempests, sweeping over kingdoms and calling up the rude billows that are levelling all high things upon the earth, have but blown their first blast. Yet see the ruins which are blocking up the streets and highways of earth; see the wrecks with which its shores are already strewn. Things most marvellous have already come to pass among the nations; things more marvellous are on their way. What has already been beheld is but as the ripple in comparison with the breaker, as the rattling of debris in comparison with the rushing fury of the rock or the avalanche.

Who shall be the interpreter of these events? For God sends no judgments without sending some messenger to declare their meaning? The Church of Christ on earth should be the interpreter of his ways. It is her office to warn the world, to take up the divine dealings one by one and tell the world what God means by them. If the Church does not seek to be the interpreter of the divine proceedings, she comes short of her calling and forgets her office. She is bound to mark the decomposing process that is going on, in order that she may tell its nature and foretel its issues. She is bound to watch the motions of that current or whirlpool which has now laid hold of the kingdoms of the earth, and to make known their true character, their origin, and their ultimate direction, whether to prosperity or to ruin, whether to stability or destruction, whether to shame or to glory.

The world's philosophers, are, in our day, every one of them becoming interpreters of the future. We cannot turn the pages of any of them, Continental or British, but we find them casting an intensely eager glance into the future. At every new event we see them turning their eye forward, attempting to pierce the mist that overhangs them.

As interpreters of the future, or as commentators on passing events in their bearing on that future, they cannot but fail. They have no data to reason upon; neither is their reason strong or keen enough to handle such data were they given. Hence their opinions on such topics are but visions, guesses, gropings. One of them could say, "in that ferment of religious discussions which now invade the world, a new future, a new order of things is stirring; and it is the duty of all well-disposed men to work to prepare its advent."* Another could thus write to a friend, "I begin

* Quinet's Ultramontanism. Lecture IX.

Digitized by Google

to believe that the future destiny of the human soul lies prophesied in the dark oracle of the material creation; each coming spring which attracts the budding plant from the earth's bosom gives me insight into the sad enigma of death, and confutes my anxious fear of an eternal sleep." *

Thus they give utterance to their own vague guesses, scorning to be taught by prophetic revelation; yet, unable to cast aside presentiments and longings. They give forth a few conjectures at random; they feel thrown forward into the future by inextinguishable instinct, as well as by the irresistible pressure of events, yet of that future they can only speak with a stammering tongue.

But they neither are nor can be the interpreters of the future. This is the Church's calling, both for her own sake and for the world's. She has not been left without the means of fulfilling this calling. She has a full prophetic page, and she has the promise of the unerring teaching of the Spirit of truth, who is sent, not only to bring all things to our remembrance, but to "show us things to come." It is thus that she is fitted to be the interpreter of the future; not by being left to guess blindly and uncertainly; but by being enabled to understand the revealed purposes of Him in whose hands that future lies. It is not given her to know *all* things: it is not even given her to know many things; but the great landmarks, the great outlines of the future, she is given to see, and that with no dim nor unsteady eye. Her knowledge in this respect and to this degree is as truly a certainty as is her knowledge of the past.

It is curious to observe the direction which the speculations and hopes of the "wise of this world" are now taking. They are going forth in search of what they call "the true and the beautiful." Keenly alive to the conviction that there is around them so much of what is both untrue and unlovely; feeling assured that this is not a state of things which can endure; they fondly anticipate a time when all that is untrue shall perish, and all that is unlovely shall vanish away. They know not indeed what they mean in such prophetic utterances. The true and the beautiful are but gay dreams to them. Yet they long for their manifestation, unconsciously uniting their voices to the groan of universal creation, that is all around them longing for deliverance. Thus one of them gives expression to his feeling, "An intellectual conflict about truth, and indeed about divine truth, is the struggle of our age; this fact is already seen

* Schiller's Philosophical Letters.

Digitized by Google

and admitted by a few, but ere long it will be still more generally acknowledged." * And thus another of them utters his fears and his hopes, "Here on earth we are as soldiers, fighting in a foreign land, that understand not the plan of the campaign and have no need to understand it; seeing well what is at our hand to be done, let us do it like soldiers, with submission, with courage, with a heroic joy. Behind us, behind each one of us, lie six thousand years of human effort, human conquest; before us is the boundless time, with its as yet uncreated and unconquered continents and Eldorados, which we, even we, have to conquer, to create; and from the bosom of eternity shine for us celestial guiding stars." † Thus they breathe forth their uncertain desires and hopes, as men in whose souls there dwells some bright idea of the true and the beautiful, and who feel that they cannot be satisfied till that idea becomes a reality on earth.

This idea of theirs is not without its development. The germ of truth is in it, just as there was in the heathen anticipations that preceded the former Advent, and opened even the lips of poets to sing of coming peace. Yet, after all, it is but the germ,—no more. It is the vague expression of a vague longing; not the well-based hope, which, resting on a Divine promise, knows that it shall not be put to shame.

Nevertheless, the foundation of the Lord standeth sure. The day of "the true and the beautiful" is coming; and beyond the skirts of that heavy darkness that is now falling down upon the world, we can descry the gleams of its uprising. Yet, the truth and the beauty then to be disclosed are strangely different from what the wise of this world are looking for. It shall be far deeper truth and far brighter beauty than this world has yet known;—more holy, more blessed, more imperishable;—such as eye hath not seen, such as ear hath not heard, such as man's heart hath never yet conceived.

For that day we wait, amid clouds and gloom and storm. None of these shall hinder its dawning, or mar its glory, when it dawns. Nay, we know not but that these are the sure signs of its appearing,—the forerunners of its light and joy and peace. These terrific convulsions are but indications of that crisis, which shall throw off the world's long-lasting fever, bring back its primal health, and leave the past all behind it as a troubled dream.

* Schlegel's Philosophy of Life. Lecture VII.
† Carlyle's Miscellaneous Writings, vol. iii., pp. 91, 92.

Digitized by Google

To that day we look forward, as men wearying for their inheritance. As saints, that is, separated men, we glory in the expectation. For this we have been separated, and to this we have been called. The world and we have parted for ever. A carnal or earthly portion we have abjured. But a portion becoming our name, in accordance with our character,—we do look for. And as is our inheritance, so also do we ourselves seek meanwhile to be,—holy and spiritual,—partakers of the Divine nature, even as we know that we shall ere long be partakers of a Divine inheritance.

Art. II.—GOD'S THEORY OF THE WORLD.

Men's thoughts respecting the future, have, of late years, been undergoing a somewhat decided, though perhaps hasty change. There are fewer boastful predictions uttered, of tranquil days, social elevation, unbroken progress, unchecked development in the history of the race.

These day-dreams dazzled for a time; they attracted not a few; they misled multitudes; they gave tone not merely to the speculations of the thinker, but to the policy of the statesman. But they are disappearing. Facts have not come in to verify them; or rather all that have come in have totally belied them; till, one by one, they have evaporated, or transmuted themselves into thick and palpable forebodings of evil. Fretted with misgivings and weary with disappointed hope, perhaps too, somewhat ashamed at being found false prophets, some are giving way to despondency, while others seem as if they knew not which way to turn.

Some twenty years ago, men were exulting and making merry like schoolboys on the morning of a holiday; for the world's great holiday seemed dawning at last: now their mirth is hushed and their hearts are failing them for fear. It was the fashion then to predict things great and bright as the immediate issue of events then emerging, and to point triumphantly to the fair succession of levels, up which the nations were steadily ascending. The march of education, of intellect, of freedom, of reform, of science, of peace, was to be rapid and unimpeded. The impulse of self-advancement, self-elevation, then communicated to the race,

Digitized by Google

was to carry it illimitably upward. It was as if men expected their soil to burst up into new fruitfulness; their skies to put on a serener blue; their rivers to flow in a clearer current; and their seas to shake off the old tyranny of the tide and the storm.

These fond anticipations have, in a great measure, been withdrawn or reversed. Even the most worldly, who are but little careful to fashion their thoughts of the future after the mind of God, are afraid to dream their old dreams any longer. Nor do they deem it fanatical or refer to it as the indication of a morbid temperament to speak of evil days to come,—to look forward to a stoppage or break in the progress of the world, nay perhaps a movement, for a time, entirely retrograde. Evil in every form confronts them so broadly, that they can no longer slight it as a mere spectre or think to brush it aside with a touch. They begin to suspect that "the curse," though impalpable, is a reality,—a reality with which the world has to wrestle,—a reality bearing down and bearing back all onward impulse,—a reality so potent and all-diffused that even the simultaneous energies of the race, quickened to their utmost, can have but poor hope of success, in conflict with such an enemy. *

* Not that *all* are learning such lessons of truth; a fool may be brayed in a mortar, and come out a fool,—as the following swelling words of pride and boastfulness fully demonstrate:—"*Prospectus of a new Weekly Journal,* 'THE STANDARD OF FREEDOM,' *the advocate of political, commercial, and religious liberty, equitable taxation, and retrenchment.* Never was there a time which more urgently required energetic and appropriate representatives in the public press than that in which we live. If all that has been hitherto accomplished for truth and freedom and progress have found fit echoes, there is a wider field and a more peremptory necessity for that onward-encouraging voice which is to prepare the way for their future, peaceful, but vast development. We must start anew from the goal which has been already won. We must move with the tide, which is now advancing with such majestic and accelerated power. Everywhere the people are awakened—or awakening—feeling their strength — asserting their rights — establishing their liberties; and the people of this country, always first and foremost in the enduring struggle for all that honours and exalts a nation—the people of this country will be faithful to *their* noble mission.

"The path has been straightened before us. The valleys once filled with the enslaved and the humbled have been exalted, and the mountains have been brought low, where feudalism erected its standard of oppression, and a priestly hierarchy unfurled its intolerant banners. From his pride of place many a usurper has been compelled to descend, while redeemed millions have entered, and are entering upon their inheritance. The influence of will upon will has been enfeebled,—that of understanding upon understanding has been strengthened. The pillars of old authority are shaking. Inquiry is busy with its work of emancipation.

Digitized by Google

Christian men, who *study* their Bibles are beginning to be far more of one mind in reference to all these points than once they were. They are drawing closer also to each other in their sympathies; for both in sympathy and in judgment they had been far asunder. Many did cling long to the hope of gradual progress, cherishing with eager fondness the idea of unchecked ever-widening improvement, even though abjuring the profane theory of a self-reforming, self-regenerating world. That idea has given way,—that hope is broken for ever. The rush of strange events has swept the basis from under all such theories, checking the precipitancy of the buoyant and mocking the calculations of the thoughtful. God has been teaching and the Churches have been learning the lesson, though slowly and imperfectly. By "terrible things in righteousness," God has been disturbing our dreams and breaking our theories in pieces.

It has been seen that such hopes as those on which so many have been leaning are essentially *infidel*, though by no means understood as such by those who cherished them. The theory of the world and its government, of which they are the offspring, is *man's*, not *God's*. It is man's sketch of what *he* conceives the world should be; it is man's picture of what he is confident the world would become, were *he* its god and king. He would not suffer such flaws, such breaks, such retrogressions in any world of his. *He* would make the career of improvement swift and straight as an arrow. *He* would set his shoulder under it and lift it at once into eternal stability and perfection. *He* would not go to work so circuitously, as if there could be no rising

Hence the sharp controversies which have at the same time instructed and improved the people. Hence the creation of a sounder public judgment, and a stronger popular power; an advancing education, exhibited in the various institutions for the instruction of every class of society; a humanising philosophy demanding a reform of our penal code, and the abolition of the punishment of death; a higher morality, displayed in the great temperance movement—these and a hundred other noble purposes, characteristic of the age, have been elevating the individual, and slowly, but surely, preparing the community for important social and political changes.

"As such changes are foreseen by the observing,—supported by the enlightened,—desired by the patriotic,—and necessitated by the irresistible current of events,—it is proposed to give them a new and a courageous ORGAN—one that shall represent all the good that has been effected in the past, and march with the foremost of those who demand for the future that our institutions shall harmonize with the growing knowledge and liberalism of the era, and be marked by progress,—peaceful, but efficient progress."

Digitized by Google

without a falling, no living without a dying, no consolidating without a crumbling, no light without darkness as its precursor, no calm save as the offspring of the storm.

Actuaries, in proceeding with their calculations, know well of what moment it is not to leave out a single element, however small, positive or negative. One such element overlooked or wrongly placed would disturb the most accurate and laboured calculation, especially if the omitted element happened to be near the outset of the process. In such a case the result would not only be a failure, but a falsehood; not only useless, but fitted thoroughly to mislead. Just so has it been with these religious actuaries or accountants. They have made their calculations and given us their results. These are, — a happy and harmonious world,—gradually rising, prospering, and regenerating itself by its own agencies and energies.

It is found, however, that these results are at variance with facts. By no method of ingenuity can they be reconciled. Theory and event seem to bid defiance to each other. Were these facts solely those of the olden time, they might be set aside as out of date; but the new facts which are every day rising to the surface, differ but little from the old. Their hostility both to philosophic and religious optimism, is not less decided than that of former days. The scenes of the nineteenth century wear the same broken aspect, and call for the same interpretation of their meaning as those of the sixteenth. There is but one utterance throughout, however much man may endeavour to persuade himself to the contrary. Each new fact seems with greater emphasis than its predecessor to give the lie to the well-summed calculations of theoretic optimists.

How is this? The men we speak of are shrewd, wise, skilled in calculation. True. Nay more, some of them are religious men,—men who would not deliberately set up their speculations in opposition either to the events of Providence, or the revelations of the word of God. But they have proceeded upon defective *data*. They have left out most weighty elements,—elements which lie at the very basis of the process,—elements which though not denied *per se*, are yet set aside in combination, or have far less weight attached to them than they are entitled to. They have omitted such things as the utter malignity of sin, its incurableness and tendency to reproduce and extend itself illimitably,—the power and unquenchable hatred of fallen spirits to the earth

Digitized by Google

and its races,—the deep wickedness of a human heart,—the righteous vengeance of God against sin and the sinner. These are a few out of the many elements that have been overlooked or misplaced, or underrated. The omission of these, has been fatal to the correctness of the result. Had no such elements existed, their calculations might have been exact enough; but the existence of these overthrew them all. They will not bear a moment's examination. They are as far wide of the truth as would be the calculations of one, who, in trying to estimate the future population of our globe, some forty years hence, should omit the deaths, casualties, and various checks to which the race is subject, taking simply into account the births; and giving the earth credit for prosperous days, entire salubrity of clime, and an unblighted soil.*

God's "theory" of a fallen world and its progress, is widely diverse from man's. His world moves onward and, finally, upward, by a series of checks, reverses, desolations. It is not a world where all is ever-brightening day; but a world of alternate day and night, sunshine and shadow. It is not a world made up of one fair spring or summer, with no frost or blight, or leaf-fall. The time is hastening, indeed, when it shall be so; when flower and fruit, fruit and flower, shall follow each other, month upon month. But meanwhile, it is not so. There is the blooming and the fading; there is the springing and the drooping; there is the bursting bud, and the falling leaf; there is the calm and the tempest; there is summer and winter; there are the alternations, the reverses by which God is carrying up his world to the height and glory which he has in store for it. There is life, but it is to be reached only through death; there is glory, but to it we must pass through shame. There is the kingdom that cannot be moved,—*βασιλέια ἀσάλευτος*,—but it is attained only by the

* It was in the following terms that the Unitarian Channing, eight or nine years ago, addressed the mechanics of Boston:—"That members of the labouring class, at the close of a day's work, should assemble in such a hall as this, to hear lectures on science, history, ethics, and the most stirring topics of the day, from men whose education is thought to fit them for the highest offices, is a proof of *social revolution to which no bounds can be set, and from which too much cannot be hoped.* I see in it a *repeal of the sentence passed by ages on the mass of mankind.* I see in it *the dawn of a new era*, in which it will be understood that the first object of society is to give *incitement and progress* to all its members." We quote the above sentence as an apt illustration of our remarks.

Digitized by Google

shaking of all things here;* there is the "restitution," αποκαταστασις; the "regeneration," παλιγγενησια; the "day of rest," σαββατισμος; but not until the foundations of earth have gone utterly out of course; not until there has been a time of trouble and terror and tumult and blood and death, threatening to engulf, nay to annihilate the world.

This is the "theory of the world" which Scripture in such manifold forms presents to us, and which prophecy especially so largely develops. It is in the latter that we have God's purpose spread out in detail; which purpose, in regard to the future, is manifestly a continuation or carrying out of principles already in play, and which have been acted on from the beginning.

It seems to be imagined by some, that the operation of such principles is now fast drawing to a close, and that though the history of the world has been a series of sinkings and risings, yet that now such vibrations are to cease, and the buoyancy of the world is to be left unhindered to work its way upward. Prophecy points to a different scene. It shows us this mysterious purpose of Jehovah still at work, whatever statesmen or philosophers may say to the contrary.

It reveals many a fearful break still in prospect, many a deep and dark descent down which our world shall be precipitated, ere it reach its destined elevation and permanence. It tells us that *the world's worst days are not yet past*, whatever men may fancy. And thus turning our eye to these

* Have our readers ever observed what an illustration of the apostle's words in the above passage (Heb. xii. 26-28), is the twenty-fourth chapter of Isaiah? The first twenty-two verses form a detailed narration of the "shakings," and then the twenty-third verse brings before us "the kingdom that cannot be moved," which is to emerge from these shakings,—

"Behold!
Jehovah maketh the earth empty and maketh it waste!
Yea He turneth it upside down and scattereth its inhabitants.
* * * * * *
The earth mourneth and fadeth away,
The world languisheth and fadeth away.
* * * * * *
The earth is utterly broken down (or grievously shaken);
The earth is clean dissolved (or shattered to pieces);
The earth is moved exceedingly.
The earth shall reel to and fro like a drunkard,
Yea, it shall be removed like a cottage."

Such are the shakings. Then comes the βασιλεία ἀσάλευτος,—the kingdom that cannot be moved.

"The Lord of Hosts shall reign!
In Mount Zion and in Jerusalem;
And before his ancients gloriously!"

Digitized by Google

things, it presents to us the same theory of the world that has been exhibiting from the beginning,—the only theory that can light us through the gloom of present evils, and preserve us from the vile delusions with which politicians and philosophers are thus leading the blinded multitudes.

This, among numerous others, is one of the advantages of prophetic study. Many have found it so; they have been set right in their theory of the world. They have learned the difference between God's theory and man's theory. They see God's purpose to prostrate the creature, yet to lay the foundation of future and everlasting elevation. They see His purpose to prove that there is no state of creature-hood so good, that it will not lapse into all evil; and yet that there is no state of creature-hood so evil, that the highest good and holiness may not be educed from it. They enter into God's purpose regarding both the evil and the good. The complicated mechanism of the world is in part made plain, its movements are more fully understood and sympathized with; the glory to be revealed is more fondly wearied for, and the kingdom which cannot be moved anticipated as the only kingdom that can realize the hopes and the pictures which politicians love so well to fashion for themselves, and their dazzled votaries.

Art. III.—HOW SHOULD UNFULFILLED PROPHECY BE STUDIED?

The study of unfulfilled prophecy has often been deprecated as useless, or even as productive of positively injurious effects on the mind of the inquirer. The deprecation is scarcely worthy of a moment's notice,—for to encourage us in that study, we have the approbation of the Holy Ghost. Speaking expressly of the prophetic word that relates to the coming of Christ in his kingdom and glory, He says, "Hereunto ye do well that ye take heed." These words of the Spirit make us bold not only to disregard the opposition offered by some to the prosecution of our inquiries into revealed futurity, but even to reprove our opponents, as, in this particular, "savouring not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." Not a few have spoken of unfulfilled prophecy, as if it were involved in such impenetrable obscurity, that the signification of it could not possibly be ascertained, till, by receiving an actual fulfilment, it had been

Digitized by Google

transferred to the province of history. The Holy Ghost, on the contrary, speaks of it, as "a light shining in a dark place." He compares the future to a dark place, but prophecy itself to a light, which serves partially to illuminate the darkness. Let us, then, only confine our observations and inquiries, as to *what will be*, within the circle of illumination, which "the sure word of prophecy" sheds around it—let us not carry forward our curious speculations into the surrounding darkness, which not a ray of God-given light penetrates,—let us not, through love of theory, or force of prejudice, either shut our eyes to what the light reveals, or deduce from it rash and unwarranted conclusions,—let us combine childlike docility with a sincere desire of ascertaining the mind of God,—let us be careful to distinguish what is imperfectly revealed, and therefore dubious, from what is declared plainly, and therefore certain,—so shall we, by the grace of God, attain to an assured knowledge of the great leading events, with an anticipation, also, though less clear and determinate, of the subordinate and collateral events, which are to precede, to accompany, and to follow the Lord's second coming.

The correct method of prophetic investigation may be resolved into a variety of general rules or principles. These will be subservient to the cause of prophetic interpretation and exegesis. Let the student, however, take care to ascertain that the principles, offered for his recognition, be sound, and likewise that the application of them be made aright. We are bound to repudiate every principle of interpretation, however plausible and well-supported, as in reality unsound, and to refuse every application of a principle, the soundness of which is unquestionable, if it be in any respect opposed to such principles or canons of interpretation, as have received the impress of Divine authority. There are two canons of the latter description, to which we are desirous of calling the special attention of our readers. One of them is established by Divine precedent, or, in other words, by the providence of God, while the other is expressly taught by Him in His Word.

The first has,—to the great detriment of the Church, because to the marvellous obscuration or mystifying of truth, that, in itself, was simple, and clear, "a light shining in the dark,"—been too generally disregarded by the interpreter of prophetic Scripture. It is this,—that the language of unfulfilled prophecy must be regarded as neither more nor less literal than that of prophecy, which has been already fulfilled.

Digitized by Google

This principle dissipates a thousand airy dreams, and incoherent mystic spiritualizations, which too long were suffered to evacuate the sacred text of all the Divine thought which it contained, and to fill up the vacuum with the mere thought of man. The neglect of this principle has the effect of converting the word of prophecy, as it were, into an airy element, in which imagination may expatiate freely on the wing; but due attention to it realizes, in the word of prophecy, a rich pabulum for the nourishment of the spiritual understanding, and for the refreshment of Christian hope.

Many things, which were clearly predicted in reference to Christ, seemed to the Jewish mind extremely improbable, and altogether incompatible with other things which were predicted no less clearly regarding Him. They were therefore forced, by means of mystic or parabolical interpretation, into some measure of agreement with Jewish notions of propriety. Even the first disciples of our Lord were so disposed to seek for far-fetched and mystical meanings in His words, that oftentimes what He said, though clear as the light of day, seemed to them too abstruse to be comprehended without further explanation. Let us take an instance,—"He taught His disciples, and said unto them, The Son of Man is delivered into the hands of men, and they shall kill Him; and after that He is killed, He shall rise the third day. But they understood not that saying, and were afraid to ask Him." (Mark ix. 31.) Could language by any possibility be more direct and simple than that in which the Lord here predicts His death and resurrection? The difficulty of understanding the prediction arises exclusively from the seeming incompatibility of the things predicted with the expectations cherished by the Jews regarding the Messiah. The thoughts of God are so widely different from those of man, that man, unwilling to abandon his own thoughts, is, in consequence, unable to understand the thoughts of God, however intelligible the language in which these are expressed. The language must be perverted, tortured, mystified, that it may speak out more in harmony with the dictates of human prejudice, or human wisdom. Divine truth must be forcibly, and by a Procrustes-like operation, accommodated to man's views of rightness and propriety. The literal sense of Scripture must be rejected, because it ill accords with what *we* deem suitable to the character and dignity of Christ,—and a mystical sense must be wrung out, because it agrees better with *our* system of theology, and *our* sense of decorum. Instances might be indefinitely multiplied of predictions regarding Christ, *a literal interpretation* of

Digitized by Google

which would have shocked and disgusted the generality of the Jewish nation, before Christ appeared, and *a literal fulfilment* of which, on Christ's appearing, did so shock and disgust them, that they actually rejected Christ to their own everlasting ruin. Let us instance a few such predictions:—"They pierced my hands and my feet." "All they that see me laugh me to scorn,—they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying, He trusted on the Lord that He would deliver him,—let Him deliver him, seeing he delighted in Him." (Psalm xxii.) "They gave me also gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink." (Psalm lxix.) "Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me." (Psalm xli.) "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion: shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee; He is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass." (Zech. ix.) The unlikelihood attaching, in Jewish estimation, to a literal fulfilment of these and a thousand similar predictions, led to a perverse and evasive and mystical method of interpretation,—but, notwithstanding the unlikelihood of it, the fulfilment has been literal. So far as prophecy relates to the humiliation-advent of Christ, not one jot or tittle of it has failed. It has received an accomplishment so exact, and literal, that those are left without excuse, who spiritualize away unfulfilled prophecy into mere abstractions and impersonalities. History tells how prophecy ought to be interpreted. What the mystic interpreters of a former day would regard as a bold personification of oppressed principles, and persecuted truths, history has translated into the incarnation, suffering, and death of the Son of God. In like manner, doubtless, much that is now interpreted as relating to the triumph and universal reign of Christianity, will be translated by history into the glorious advent and manifested kingdom of "our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." In fulfilling, and so interpreting, His predictions, God has hitherto shown plainly, that "His thoughts are not as man's thoughts, nor his ways as man's ways." God has hitherto interpreted literally what man had interpreted on a very different principle. God has, in the development of His purposes, done hitherto what man, in the pride of his natural understanding, had declared to be impossible,—what man did not expect (though it was clearly predicted), because he judged it unreasonable to expect it. The principle on which God has all along interpreted even what appeared to be the

Digitized by Google

most improbable predictions of His word, is doubtless the principle on which we ought to interpret all unfulfilled prophecy. But the faithful application of that principle leads to discoveries, which are altogether at variance with the prejudices of a traditional prophetic creed; and afraid, if not horrified, at the contemplation of a future, so different in many ways from that which they have been accustomed to look for, many have fallen back upon a principle of interpretation, which, dissipating, as it does, into thin air, the literalities of the prophetic word, has the effect of carrying away the thoughts of men, in reference to the future, from all agreement with the thoughts of God. That principle extinguishes the light of prophecy, and leaves us in the dark, without anything else than vague conjecture to guide our hopes. When Bunyan is proving against infidel scoffers that the Lord Jesus will come personally in the clouds of heaven, he points to these words of Daniel,—"I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before Him. And there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve Him: His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Bunyan found here a sure proof of the doctrine that the Lord Jesus would come personally to judge the world; but what he saw good reason for interpreting literally, others, afraid of Millenarianism, have regarded as admitting only of a mystical interpretation. According to them, "One like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven," is an expression which does not mean, "One like the Son of man did come with the clouds of heaven;" it only means that judgment was executed by an invisible agency on the Antichristian powers of this world. The prediction refers, they judge, to nothing real, personal, visible,—the Advent is invisible, impersonal, and imaginary. It is an event that happens, not a person that comes. If this be *interpretation*, the Word of God is not written to be understood; "the sure word of prophecy," is not given to shine as a light in a dark place, but to make darkness, doubly dark. Let the passage referred to be interpreted with the same degree of literality which characterizes the interpretation given by God, in His providence, to predictions already accomplished, and the conclusion is inevitable that the Roman Empire, the fourth of the Danielic monarchies, will be destroyed by the Son of man, when He comes again

Digitized by Google

in His glory. If this conclusion land us in Millenarianism, what then? Better be Millenarians, and know the truth of God, than avoid Millenarianism by wrapping ourselves in error. Here we aim not at defending the hope of Christ's pre-millennial advent, but we advocate a principle of interpretation, as possessing Divine authority, and we maintain that this principle should be strictly observed, even though the observance of it do, contrary to all our preconceived opinions, lead to the discovery that Christ's advent will be pre-millennial. An inveterate prejudice, of whatever kind it be, should not make us afraid to look the truth in the face, even though we should find the truth to be widely different from what we have hitherto supposed.

We proceed now to the other canon of interpretation which we formerly referred to as bearing the stamp of Divine authority. As that, which we have just been considering, is sanctioned by the providence, so this is sanctioned by the Word, of God. It is laid down in 2 Peter i. 19, "We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed (as unto a light shining in a dark place, till the day dawn, and the daystar arise) in your hearts,—knowing this first, that no prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation; for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Here we are enjoined, in our prophetic inquiries, to bear in mind that no prophecy is of any private, that is, solitary or isolated interpretation. One passage of the prophetic Scriptures must be compared with another, in order that a correct, and, at the same time, a more enlarged and comprehensive view of the predicted future may be obtained. Each separate prediction forms part of a great system of prophetic truth, and therefore cannot be rightly understood except in connexion with other predictions, which exhibit the same subject, though in different points of view, and under a variety of different aspects. Had the numberless prophecies, which are scattered over the Book of Revelation, been merely the effusions of men, they would necessarily have wanted the character which they do possess of intimate concatenation, and systematic development. They would have presented irreconcilable discrepancies, as well as much that was loose, disjointed, and incoherent. "But holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Therefore, whatever appearances the prophetic Scriptures may to the untaught eye exhibit of incoherence, isolation, and want of unity, the fact is, that

Digitized by Google

everything, even to the most minute particulars, is arranged with consummate skill, producing one beautiful and harmonious, though manifold and complicated scheme. Minute observation will enable us to detect in every prophetic passage some articulation, or point of attachment, which joins it either directly or indirectly to every other collateral prediction in the inspired volume. To facilitate inquiry and to ascertain the truth, we must endeavour to find out the articulations referred to, and, so, going from passage to passage, draw from each the additional, or corroborative information, which it communicates on the common subject. An insulated view of the several predictions, which the Scriptures contain, seems to warrant conclusions, which a comparative view of them proves to be utterly groundless. The importance of the principle of interpretation, now before us, will be best illustrated by exemplifying, in one or two instances, the effect of its application:—

1. In 2 Peter iii., there is an awful prediction of the destruction of this world. "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat,—the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burnt up." From the whole tenor of the prophecy, it is manifest that the earth is not to be annihilated at the coming of the Lord, but, under the agency of fire, to undergo a change analogous to, though far more thorough and extensive than, that which was effected upon it by the waters of the flood. The state and character of the new earth are not particularly described, and imagination is ready to supply with its own dreams of what an elysium should be, the want of information. But let us seek farther information from the Scriptures themselves. The thirteenth verse affords a point of transition between this and another prophecy, relating to the same period. "Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens, and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." The promise of God, here quoted, or referred to, by the apostle, occurs in Isaiah lxv. 17, "Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind." Then follows a description of the new order of things: Israel is restored, houses are built, vineyards are planted, prayer is offered, and everything is very far different from what we should naturally picture in our minds as an appropriate sequel to the conflagration of all things described by the apostle. We are thus admonished to beware of measuring the thoughts, or determin-

Digitized by Google

ing the purposes of God by *our* views of what is right and fitting. The two predictions, considered in their proper connexion, place it beyond all reasonable doubt, that it is only after the coming of the Lord, and the creation of a new world, that the children of Israel are to enter on a career of national prosperity. The new earth is impressed with a resemblance to what the earth was before the fall of man. "I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people, and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her nor the voice of crying." "The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock, and dust shall be the serpent's meat; they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord." (Ver. 19, 25.) But Israel, though now *restored*, is not yet *glorified*, for their condition is spoken of in language descriptive of *blessing*, not of *glory*. "They shall build houses and inhabit them, and they shall plant vineyards and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build and another inhabit, they shall not plant and another eat, for as the days of a tree are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands." The sequel of the prophecy informs us that *some* of the Gentiles will also escape from amidst the desolating fires, by which the earth is to be destroyed, and that they, like the Jewish people, shall participate in blessing. After speaking of "the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men," in these words,—"Behold, the Lord will come with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire. For by fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh, and the slain of the Lord shall be many:" the prophet proceeds thus,—"It shall come, that I will gather all nations and tongues, and they shall come and see my glory. And I will set a sign among them, and I will send those that escape of them unto the nations, to Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, that draw the bow, to Tubal, and Javan, to the isles afar off, that have not heard my fame, neither have seen my glory, and they shall declare my glory among the Gentiles." "As the new heavens and the new earth which I will make shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." (Chap. lxvi. 15, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23.) This prophecy gives us no information regarding the resurrection of *the saints*, or their glorification, which we know is to take place on the day of the Lord's advent. But

Digitized by Google

there is another prophecy regarding the new heavens and the new earth, and in it the condition of the risen and glorified Church is particularly described. "And I saw a new heaven, and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away, and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city New Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God." By means of thus comparing prophecy with prophecy, we arrive at the knowledge of facts, which, if we confined our view to any one of the several contemporaneous predictions to which we have referred, we could not possibly discover. The Lord comes, the earth is destroyed by fire,—new heavens and a new earth are created. These facts we learn from the prediction given by the Apostle Peter. The Israelites are now converted, and established in the land of promise, the blessing of God is on their persons, and on the labour of their hands; those who escape of the Gentiles, share in the Divine blessing; the lower animals are delivered from their former wretched condition,—and Paradise is restored. These facts are revealed in the prophecy of Isaiah. The Church, which before had suffered, is now glorified together with Christ; the glorified Church dwells with Christ in the heavenly Jerusalem,—it reigns with Him for ever and ever. These facts are made known to us in the Apocalypse. It is then manifest, that when the present world has been destroyed, and a new order of things sprung into existence, there will be seen two different ranks or classes of the redeemed; all the saints, who had previously believed, being now, as the Bride of Christ, the second Eve, seated on the throne of the second Adam, and associated with Him in the government of the world; while those of Israel, and of the Gentile nations who, though not previously converted, do yet escape the fiery vengeance of the Lord at His coming, occupy, on the surface of the renewed earth, a place of inferiority and subordination to the glorified saints.

2. In 1 Cor. xv. 54, it is written, "When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." Nothing is mentioned in this prophecy concerning the events which shall accompany or follow the resurrection of the saints; but we are not left to arbitrary conjecture on the subject. The

Digitized by Google

quotation of these words, "Death is swallowed up in victory," connects the prophecy before us with another, which occurs in Isaiah, and a comparison of the one with the other enables us to ascertain the fact that the resurrection of the saints is contemporaneous with the restoration of Israel. In Isaiah xxiv., towards the end, the destruction of the Antichristian power is predicted, and the reign of Christ with His saints announced. "It shall come to pass in that day that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. * * * Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before His ancients gloriously." There immediately follows a burst of glad and grateful anticipation, in the midst of which the prophet utters the words, which, as we have already seen, are quoted by Paul as predicting the resurrection of the saints, "He will swallow up death in victory." (Chap. xxv.) In the following chapter, the resurrection of Christ's body, the Church, is more fully declared, "Thy dead men shall live. My dead body, they shall arise. Awake, and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." (Ver. 19.) The saints now raised from the grave enter into *the mansions prepared* for their reception, and the Lord straightway executes vengeance on the wicked. "Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee: hide thyself, as it were, for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast. For, behold, the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity: the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain." (Ver. 20, 21.) Israel now prospers, and is made the channel of blessing to the whole earth. "He shall cause them that come of Jacob to take root: Israel shall blossom and bud, and fill the face of the world with fruit." (Chap. xxvii. 6.) We thus arrive at precisely the same results as we obtained in the former instance. We again find, on a comparative view of distinct, but parallel and connected prophecies, that the coming of the Lord, the resurrection of the saints, the infliction of punishment on the wicked, the restoration of Israel, and the diffusion of universal blessing over the earth, are events either of simultaneous occurrence, or that follow one another in rapid succession.

3. Let us exemplify, yet in another instance, the principle of interpretation which we are endeavouring to illustrate,—and still in connexion with the predicted destinies of

Digitized by Google

Israel. The Prophet Jeremiah gives the following account of Israel's *tribulation* and subsequent deliverance:—"We have heard a voice of trembling, of fear, and not of peace. Ask ye now, and see whether a man doth travail with child? Wherefore do I see every man with his hands on his loins, as a woman in travail, and all faces are turned into paleness? Alas! for that day is great, so that none is like it: it is even the time of Jacob's trouble, but he shall be saved out of it. For it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord of hosts, I will break his yoke from off thy neck, and will burst thy bonds, and strangers shall no more serve themselves of him. But they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them. Therefore fear thou not, O my servant Jacob, saith the Lord; neither be dismayed, O Israel: for, lo, I will save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return, and shall be in rest, and be quiet, and none shall make him afraid. For I am with thee, saith the Lord, to save thee. Though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee: but I will correct thee in measure, and will not leave thee altogether unpunished." (Chap. xxx.) An isolated or "private interpretation" of this prophecy would, according to the different preconceptions of men, lead to very different conclusions. Each would be led by the bias of prejudice or the force of habit, or the liveliness of imagination, to associate in his mind with the restoration of Israel, a variety of other events as likely to be contemporaneous. But let us believe meanwhile no more than the prediction warrants, and let us go, with our craving for farther information, to other predictions relating to the close of Israel's trouble. Let us pass from Jeremiah to Daniel, and we shall find something of additional truth. "At that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince, which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some [Heb. they] to everlasting life, and some [i. e., the rest] to shame and everlasting contempt." (Chap. xii.) Here it is plainly foretold that the time of Israel's deliverance from trouble is coincident with that of the resurrection of the saints to everlasting life. But it is an acknowledged point that the coming of the Lord and the resurrection of the saints will be contemporaneous events.

Digitized by Google

It therefore follows that the deliverance of Israel will coincide, in point of time, with the coming of the Lord. This latter coincidence is expressly affirmed by our Lord in Matthew xxiv. In the prediction there recorded, the Lord connects the close of Israel's trouble with His advent in glory. That He speaks of the same tribulation as Jeremiah and Daniel cannot be denied, for if it were a different tribulation, then clearly the asseverations, which are made in the three several predictions, would be not merely hyperbolical, but positively incompatible. The Lord describes the tribulation thus:—"*There shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be.*" The words of Daniel regarding it are as follows—"*There shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time.*" Exactly correspondent is the description given by Jeremiah:—"*Alas! for that day is great, so that none is like it; it is even the day of Jacob's trouble.*" The tribulation begins with the destruction of Jerusalem, and continues throughout the whole period during which Israel is dispersed, and Jerusalem trodden under foot of the Gentiles:—but it is *the last crisis, the closing agony*, of the tribulation, to which our Lord, as well as the prophets, Jeremiah and Daniel, particularly refers. What then is the Lord's prediction relative to the close of the tribulation, and consequently to the enlargement of Israel? "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken;—and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." Prosecuting, then, a comparative interpretation of prophecy, we again find that the coming of the Lord, the resurrection of the saints, and the deliverance of Israel, are to be contemporaneous occurrences. If we enlarge the field of induction, we shall find the Lord's advent and Israel's restoration uniformly connected with one another. About to leave the temple for the last time, the Lord closed his awful denunciation of Jerusalem in these words: "Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." To the same effect it is predicted in Hosea: "I will go and return to my place [i. e., at the right hand of the Father,] till they

acknowledge their offence and seek my face: in their affliction they shall seek me early. Come, and let us return unto the Lord; for he hath torn, and he will heal us; he hath smitten, and he will bind us up; after two days will he revive us; in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight. Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord. His going forth is prepared as the morning, [he is 'the bright and the morning star,'] and he shall come unto us as the rain, as the latter and former rain unto the earth." Again, in Zechariah: "It shall come to pass in that day, that I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem, and I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication, and they shall look upon me, whom they have pierced, [according to the prediction, 'Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also that pierced him;'] and they shall mourn for him as one that mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born." In reference to the same events it is written, chap. xiv., "I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle. * * * Then shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle. And his feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east. * * * * And the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee." In the Epistle to the Romans, chap. ix., the restoration of Israel is in like manner connected with the resurrection of the elect Church, and coming of the Lord: "If the casting away of them [i. e., the Jews] be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but *life from the dead?*"—"Blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved; as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins."

Is it not evident, from a comparative view of these prophecies, that all the saints, who are called to reign with Christ, as His Bride, must be gathered in and raised from the dead to glory, before Israel be nationally saved, and universal blessing be diffused over the earth? Did we not apply, in the interpretation of prophetic Scripture, the rule, which the Holy Ghost has expressly laid down for our guidance, we should be comparatively ignorant of the great mystery of godliness, which is in progress of development.

Digitized by Google

Though analogous to what we already know of God's method of procedure, it would perhaps never have occurred to our minds, that even as Christ, the Head, is now in glory, while the members of His body are in a state of humiliation, so Christ, and the Elect Church, the Bride, the Lamb's wife, shall hereafter be with Him in a state of glory, while Israel, nationally restored, and such of the Gentiles as shall be saved to re-people the new earth, shall be in an unglorified state, though enriched with the manifold blessings, which, through the reign of Christ and His risen saints, shall be dispensed in "the world to come."

The illustrations, now given, of the principle that "no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation," will suffice to show what an important influence that principle has in determining the result of inquiry into the predicted Future. In offering these illustrations, we have endeavoured to bear constantly in mind the other great principle, which requires an interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy as literal as that which God has given to fulfilled prophecy in the volume of his providence.

The difficulties which seem to encompass the study of all prophecy relating to the future, have only to be encountered in the proper way, and they will either disappear, or be found to be vastly less formidable than they seemed at the outset. Many of them are factitious, originating in the idea that prophecy is written in a style so obscure and mystical, as to elude the efforts which anything but the most subtle ingenuity makes to explain it. These disappear the instant that God's literal translation of prophecy into history has taught us on what principle to interpret the predictions which have not as yet been realized. Many other difficulties arise from the substitution of theory for patient and docile investigation, or of gratuitous conjecture for a diligent comparison of one part of the roll of prophecy with another. These will vanish, if only, in accordance with the second principle of inquiry, which has passed under our consideration, the information which one prediction fails to afford, be sought, not from imagination, but from parallel portions of the prophetic word.

"No prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation." The principle here inculcated is, in relation to prophetic study, nothing else than what, in relation to other departments of knowledge, is known as the characteristic principle of the Baconian philosophy. It demands an induction of facts, or extended basis of observation, in order

Digitized by Google

that the truth may be satisfactorily established. Seeing that there is a wondrously close analogy between the Word of God and the work of God, why should not the same method of investigation be adopted in reference to the former, which has been employed so successfully in reference to the latter? If the student come to the investigation of nature with a preconceived hypothesis, he will endeavour to accommodate facts to his hypothesis, not his hypothesis to facts; and consequently, he will remain in the end well-nigh as ignorant of the true laws of nature as he was at the beginning. So, too, in the study of prophecy, if the belief of the inquirer be not based on a comparative view of collateral predictions, but brought along with him at the outset, he will occupy his time, not in humbly learning the truth of God, but in endeavouring by elaborate argumentation to adapt, in turn, every prediction to his antecedent belief. To examine prophecy in the light of views previously and prematurely formed, is a very different thing from examining one prophecy in the light of another. Let the latter kind of examination be instituted according to the will of God,—let it be conducted with becoming self-distrust, and due subjection of mind to the authority of Scripture, — the discovery of truth will be the result; truth which will, perhaps, startle by its strangeness and its air of unlikelihood, but which in due time will be substantiated by being embodied among the facts of history.

OBJECTIONS AND DIFFICULTIES.

It is our purpose, if the Lord will, to devote a series of papers to the consideration of the various objections which have been urged against the pre-millennial advent and reign of Christ, and to the solution of the difficulties which are thrown in the way of inquirers. The first question, doubtless, is, "What is written?" But still it is right that we should do what in us lies to clear away all stumbling-blocks, especially as Satan often makes a mighty handle of these, not only in holding back inquirers, but in confusing the minds of those who have received the truth. We begin with,—

THE INTERCESSION OF CHRIST.

The intercession of the Redeemer for his people is a truth very dear to every believer. It is his present work. His atonement is past—it is completed, but he ever liveth to

Digitized by Google

make intercession for us. Do we desire to contemplate him in his state of glory? we must realize his presence at the right hand of God, exercising his office of advocate for us with the Father. Are we longing and labouring for a fuller enjoyment of the blessings which his death has purchased? we must cast ourselves upon his intercession. He furnishes the incense which accompanies the prayers of saints unto the throne of grace. It is obvious, therefore, that upon the uninterrupted continuance of this intercession all our hopes depend, and any scheme of doctrine which requires the supposition that his advocacy shall even for a moment cease, must be wholly unscriptural. This remark will serve to show, that the intercession of the Redeemer must have an important bearing upon our views of things to come; and it is just because of this relation that we propose to devote a little space to the consideration of it.

The intercession of Christ is part of his priestly office. "This man," says the apostle, "because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable *priesthood;* WHEREFORE he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make *intercession* for them." (Heb. vii. 24, 25.) And again, "We have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens." (Heb. viii. 1.) The act which Christ performs at the right hand of God is, therefore, a sacerdotal act. It cannot, however, be the offering of sacrifice; for that he did once for all upon Calvary, so that it must necessarily be the act of intercession. That this work is indeed part of the office of a priest, and inseparably connected with his other and more peculiar work of making an atonement, is evident from the example of the priests under the law. On the great day of atonement, the High Priest having slain the sacrifice and caught its blood in a basin, cast on the burning coals in his censer a handful of incense; and while the cloud of smoke covered the mercy-seat, he sprinkled on it seven times the blood which he had brought within the vail. (Lev. xvi. 11—14.) This was a typical representation of Christ's intercessory work; for the apostle tells us, that "Christ being come, a High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building, neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." (Heb. ix. 11.) There is an intimate and indissoluble connexion between the sacrifice and the intercession.

Digitized by Google

It is because Christ has suffered, that he is our advocate with the Father. Nay, more; it is in virtue of his having presented the finished atonement before the throne of God, that he stands as our Mediator in the heavenly places not made with hands. The earthly High Priest dared not come within the vail unless when bearing the blood of the victim. It was only then that the sweet-smelling incense ascended with acceptance. And in like manner our Great High Priest, having also somewhat to offer, enters into the presence of God, and thenceforth "there is given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers (*lit.*, add it to the prayers) of all saints upon the golden altar which is before the throne." (Rev. viii. 3.)

The intercession of Christ in behalf of those for whom he makes atonement is PERPETUAL. To its prevalence is to be ascribed their being brought at first from darkness into light; by it the pardon of their daily sins is procured: without it, they could not maintain the conflict with sin and Satan. It is the intercession of Christ which obtains for believers the indwelling of the Spirit, and thus enables them daily to grow in holiness and in meetness for their future inheritance: to it they owe the security which they enjoy of perseverance to the end. And when the time shall arrive for the accomplishment of the gracious promises which God has vouchsafed them, it shall be the intercession of the Redeemer which shall open the everlasting gates of glory, introduce the redeemed to the presence of their Heavenly Father, and remove the flaming sword which has closed the way of the tree of life ever since Adam was expelled from the garden of Eden. Nor is even this all. The joys to which they shall be introduced shall be unending, the inheritance they receive shall be one which shall never pass away; but this very perpetuity of blessedness is dependent upon the perpetuity of our Saviour's intercession. He shall never cease to ask, and they shall never cease to receive. Some, indeed, have imagined that Christ's intercession shall cease when all the elect shall have been brought into a state of glory. For such an affirmation there not only appears to be no warrant in Scripture, but the Word of God does most manifestly contradict it. "He is a priest FOR EVER." (Heb. vii. 17.) There shall never be a time when Jesus shall be, and yet shall not exercise the office of a priest. "He ever liveth to make intercession." (Heb. vii. 25.) His intercession shall be as perpetual as his life. The frame of created things may pass away, and all that ever man has looked upon may disappear, but our advocate with the Father

Digitized by Google

shall be still the channel of communication between God and man, by his intercession drawing down the blessings which he shall dispense with unwearied grace.

The continual intercession of our blessed Redeemer is truly the anchor of the believer's faith which entereth within the vail. It has been asserted, that every one who looks for a coming of Christ to this earth before the millennium, must necessarily admit that there will be an interruption in the continuance of Christ's intercession. If it be so, let us at once cast away our expectations. Founded though our hopes of Christ's return in his kingdom were on what we thought the clearest warrant of Scripture, we must have been mistaken. Let us deceive ourselves no longer. At all hazards we must hold by the doctrine of Christ's continued intercession. Once let that go, and the whole edifice which mercy has been building up ever since the first promise of a Redeemer was given to Adam, must at once fall into ruins.

Happily there is, in reality, no such alternative necessary. We may look for a pre-millennial advent without surrendering our belief of a perpetual intercession. Let us, then, examine the argument by which it is attempted to prove that these two things are incompatible.

It is said, that Christ's intercession depends on his personal presence at the right hand of God; that its prevalence is grounded upon his continually presenting his perfected sacrifice in the heavenly places not made with hands; and that if he were again to visit this earth, the work of presenting the memorials of his atonement must be suspended, and his intercession itself interrupted. To this, however, it may be replied,—

I. That the objection proceeds upon an entire misconception of the relation between the atonement and the intercession of the Redeemer. It was, indeed, absolutely necessary, as we have already shown, that the sacrifice offered up for the sins of many should be brought within the vail. Without this the work of atonement could not have been held as completed; just as the reconciliation made by the High Priest was not accomplished till the blood of the victim was carried into the most holy place. But when Christ had *once* thus presented himself before the Father, there seems no reason why this act should be repeated, or why his continual presence should be necessary in order to secure the efficacy of his intercession. Scripture testimony and analogy seem equally opposed to such a view. The apostle tells us, that "Christ entered in *once* into the holy place." (Heb. ix. 12.)

Digitized by Google

The word in the original is ἐφαπαξ, which means *once for all.* The same expression is twice used in this epistle with reference to the work of Christ, both times with the same meaning; and in one of them it is rendered in our version, *once for all.* "Christ needeth not daily to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did *once for all* when he offered up himself." (Heb. vii. 27.) "We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ *once for all.*" (Heb. x. 10.) "By his own blood he entered *once for all* into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." (Heb. ix. 12.) From these passages it is plain that the "entering in" belongs rather to the work of atonement than to that of intercession; that it is one of those things which are done "once for all;" and that being once performed, eternal intercession may be founded on it.*

It might, indeed, be argued, that because on the day of atonement the High Priest offered incense only while the blood of the sacrifice was being presented in the most holy place, and no longer, therefore Christ's intercession can only continue while he is himself in the immediate presence of God. The typical service, however, when read correctly, teaches a very different lesson. The burning of incense was not confined to the day of atonement; it was a service performed every morning and evening. (Exod. xxx. 8, 9.) We have a case in point recorded in Luke i. 8—11. Zacharias was engaged in the office of burning incense when the angel announced to him the approaching birth of John the Baptist; and the fact is noted, that while he was doing so the whole multitude of the people were engaged in praying without. So David says, "Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice." (Psal. cxli. 2). Hence we may conclude, that the daily burning of incense was typical of the daily acceptance of the prayers offered up to God by his people through the intercession of Christ. But upon what is this acceptance founded? Why, upon the annual service of the day of atonement. The blood sprinkled

* "Upon supposition of the obedience of Christ in this life, and the atonement made by his blood for sin, with his exaltation thereon,—there is nothing in any essential property of the nature of God, nothing in the eternal unchangeable law of obedience to hinder, but that God might work all those things in us unto his own honour and glory, in the eternal salvation of his Church and the destruction of all its enemies, *without a continuance of the administration of the offices of Christ in heaven,* and all that sacred solemnity of worship wherewith it is accompanied."—*Owen. Christologia.* Chap. xx.

Digitized by Google

then completed the reconciliation, in virtue of which the cloud of incense arose morning and evening from the golden altar. And just so, when Christ once for all entered into the holy places not made with hands, the foundation was laid, and all the foundation that was necessary, for his continued intercession, wherever his human nature might be, whether in the immediate presence of God or elsewhere.

II. The fact that Christ did actually intercede *before* he suffered, seems to furnish conclusive proof that his personal presence in heaven is not necessary to the performance of that priestly work. Were the Old Testament saints saved *without* the intercession of the Redeemer? Assuredly not. Christ, then, must have commenced his intercessory office before he ascended into heaven. But of this matter we have even plainer proof. The prayer which is recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John's Gospel is, in its character, altogether intercessory, and has always been regarded as an example of the manner in which he now conducts the office of a priest on high. But that prayer was offered upon earth; and it follows, therefore, that it is not necessary to the work of intercession that Christ should be personally present in heaven. We must never forget, however, that whatever Christ did in the exercise of his mediatorial functions before he suffered, was founded upon the certainty of that decease he was to accomplish at Jerusalem. "As he was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," says Charnock, "so, by the same reason, he was an advocate pleading from the foundation of the world. The credit of his plea is the same with that of his passion. As he was a sufferer by promise from the foundation of the world, so he was an Intercessor by virtue of that promise. There is the same reason of his intercession upon the credit of his future suffering, as there was for his pardon of sin upon the credit of his future passion. . . . . Though he was not actually installed in all his offices, yet he exercised them, if I may so speak, as a candidate. As a King, he ruled his Church; as an Angel, he guided Israel; as a Prophet, he sent the prophets of the Old Testament, and revealed his will to them." If, then, there is ground for Christ's intercession upon the credit of his future suffering, why should there not be ground for it upon the credit of his past suffering, and upon that alone? If he has already interceded before he became man, and after his incarnation, while he was still upon earth, why should it be held a thing impossible that he should intercede when upon the earth again? If he leave the right hand of the

Digitized by Google

Majesty on high, and again descends to this lower world, the fact of his having once for all entered into the holy places not made with hands, must necessarily be as good a foundation for his intercession then, as the certain futurity of it was, for the same act, before he ascended at all.

III. Scripture itself seems to teach us that Christ shall hereafter intercede *upon earth.* "He shall be a Priest upon his throne." (Zech. vi. 13.) This verse, indeed, is commonly interpreted of the present time. Christ, it is said, is now upon his throne, and is executing at once the offices of a priest and of a king. This interpretation, however, appears to be entirely erroneous; and although a full inquiry on this point would involve us in all the details of a pre-millennial controversy, yet we may notice one or two of the reasons which induce us to think so. Such a view of the passage does not accord with the previous part of the vision, which, under the figure of the building of a temple, exhibits an entire history of the Christian Church. It is only *after* the temple has been completed—after the topstone has been laid in its place, that Christ is represented as sitting and ruling on his throne. But all are surely agreed that the gathering in of the Church is not completed until Christ shall come again. Besides, all the passages in which Christ's throne is spoken of, as distinguished from the Father's, lead to the conclusion that it will not be set up until he revisits the earth, and that meanwhile he is seated on the Father's throne. From Matt. xix. 28, we learn that it is in the regeneration (i.e., the making all things new) that Christ shall sit upon the throne of his glory; and it is equally plain from Matt. xxv. 31, that he shall so sit only when he comes in his own glory, and in the glory of his Father and of the holy angels: while in Rev. iii. 21, Christ himself makes a distinction between his own throne and his Father's, when he says, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with *me* on *my* throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father on *his* throne." He is now sitting on his Father's throne: hereafter he shall sit on his own.

But if when Christ comes again he shall be a Priest upon his throne, then he must continue to intercede after he has left his Father's throne and descended to this earth. From every creature under heaven the voice of joy and of gladness, of praise and of thanksgiving, shall then be ascending, and he, the head of the whole redeemed creation, and yet himself the uncreated one, shall continually present unto the Father the homage of his blood-bought people; and shall, moreover,

Digitized by Google

be the channel through whom the blessings of salvation shall flow forth to them for evermore. Has not the day of atonement a service setting forth this part of the office of the royal priesthood of the Redeemer? There was not only the slaying of the sin-offering, the carrying of the blood into the most holy place, and the sending forth of the scape-goat into the wilderness, but there were certain meat-offerings, the presenting of which formed part of the ritual of the day. (Num. xxix. 7—11.) When, therefore, the High Priest, after the solemn reconciliation, came forth and offered in the presence of the people these eucharistic sacrifices, the service most strikingly prefigured the thankful adoration of a world redeemed, laid at the feet of the eternal Jehovah by him, their King and Priest, in whose name alone they are offered, and through whose merits only they can find acceptance.

IV. But lastly, those who deny the *pre*-millennial advent of Christ, on the ground that it would interrupt the continuity of his intercession, do themselves believe in a *post*-millennial advent. In order to avoid being pressed with their own objection, they are in the habit of affirming that the Redeemer's intercession ceases when he leaves his Father's right hand, the work having then terminated to the accomplishment of which intercession is necessary. This notion of the cessation of Christ's priestly office has certainly no countenance in the Word of God, nor is it attempted to be founded on any express declaration contained therein. We have already attempted to show, that as long as there are blessings to be enjoyed, so long must Christ's intercession continue, in order to procure and convey these blessings; and we might, therefore, here leave the discussion, with the remark, that if the Redeemer's personal presence in heaven is necessary to his intercession, then, on any hypothesis, that intercession must be interrupted by his second coming. We are tempted, however, to make a few additional observations, in order to show the extreme weakness of the hypothesis. Let us admit, then, for the sake of argument, that it is true, that when the elect shall all have been brought to glory Christ's intercessory work shall terminate, and we shall still contend that the period for this cessation will not have arrived when Christ shall leave his Father's right hand. For there are some things yet to be done after his coming the second time which belong to his mediatorial office; and this must be admitted even by those who contend that that advent is *post*-millennial. The resurrection does not take place; the great judgment of the quick and the dead does not take place; the last enemy, death, is not destroyed; the righteous

Digitized by Google

are not put into possession of the kingdom;—nor is the kingdom delivered to the Father until he has again descended to the earth. These, it will not be denied, are parts of his kingly office, and parts therefore of his mediatorial work. But if his mediatorial work is not completed when he leaves his Father's throne, then neither can it be said that his priestly office has terminated. He cannot be a Mediator and not a Priest. His priesthood must be equal in duration with his sovereignty. If, then, he is still the Great High Priest after he has left the heavens, he must be engaged in interceding even when he comes again; for this is the only portion of his priestly office which was not brought to an end when he entered the holy places not made with hands.

Thus, then, from divers considerations, all drawn from Scripture, the conclusion appears to be irresistible, that Christ's intercession is eternal; that this work proceeded before he suffered, upon the credit of his perfected sacrifice; that it is now continued in virtue of his having once for all appeared in the holy places not made with hands; and that it can suffer no interruption by his coming in his kingdom, but that he shall continue then even as he now is, the eternal High Priest of his people.

Art. V.—THE GENERAL SCOPE OF THE APOCALYPSE.

A view of the Apocalypse, directly opposite to that of Professor Stuart and the German writers, who have restricted it to the days of Nero, has been advocated by several writers in our own country. They suppose that the whole, or nearly the whole, is unfulfilled, and relates to a time still future. Such a view, of course, frees them from all necessity of historical research, and its truth or falsehood can be tested by internal evidence alone. In one respect the two extreme opinions agree, since they both confine the prophecy to a few years, or the events of one single generation. In the time of its fulfilment, however, they differ most widely. The one class place it in the days of Nero and Vespasian, while the others delay it more than eighteen hundred years. It may be useful to analyse the most recent defence of this view, in a recent pamphlet on Apocalyptic interpretation.

I. The first reason urged in favour of the system is, that the book cannot otherwise have benefited the Church at all as prophecy, but only as fulfilled history. Every historical

Digitized by Google

exposition, it is thought, will be found wanting, when tried by this Scripture balance. It makes the prophecy useless until after the event.

What, now, is the real contrast between the two systems? On the Futurist view, no part of the work has hitherto been of any use as fulfilled prophecy, to strengthen the faith of Christians in the ceaseless providence of God. On the contrary, it has been a fruitful nursery of mere delusions, destitute of one particle of real truth. Next, the whole must have been useless, for seventeen centuries, as a prophecy of events near at hand, of practical interest and concern to those successive generations; since no such events are contained in the prediction. Thirdly, it has been of no real use, in all its earlier visions, as a warning of events to happen at the close of two thousand years, since no Christian, for so many ages, ever applied it to such events as the Futurist scheme supposes, occurring at that distance of time. Hence, even as unfulfilled prophecy, on this view of its meaning, it has bred nothing but false expectations, either of events which are not predicted at all, or which have been anticipated more than a thousand years out of their true place. It has been wholly useless, as *fulfilled* prophecy, and just as useless, for seventeen centuries, as prophecy *unfulfilled;* while its benefit will have been confined to six or seven writers of our own days, and the small minority of Christians, who have faith in their novel principle of interpretation.

On the wider view of its meaning, the prophecy has announced, to every age of the Church, and each generation of believers, events that were really near at hand. In every later age, it also contains many predictions already fulfilled, and of which the fulfilment has been more or less clearly discerned by thoughtful Christians. It has been, at least, possible, and indeed highly probable, that many believers, in every age, should have been warned by it of imminent changes, and have had their faith in God's word confirmed by many glimpses of its actual fulfilment. Whatever system we adopt, it is plain that many erroneous expectations and defective expositions have gathered around this holy prophecy. But on the larger interpretation it becomes certain that much valuable and seasonable truth has been mingled with these errors, that the faith of Christians has been strengthened in their review of the past, and their hopes and fears guided rightly by warnings of the future. On the other hand, it is the unhappy distinction of the Futurist system, that it compels us to regard the prophecy hitherto, as an *ignis*

Digitized by Google

fatuus, and not a beacon light; which has served only to delude the Church with a perpetual series of false hopes, unreal fulfilments, and expositions as utterly baseless and untrue as the oracles of the heathen. This Divine gift, at least one large part of it, will thus have proved a deception and a snare, except to a very small minority of readers in this last generation.

II. The second reason advanced is, that all other views of its scope are based on mere presumption and hypothesis, while the Futurist scheme alone conforms to the rules of inductive inquiry. It had been observed, in Mr. Elliott's *Horæ Apocalypticæ* that two presumptions might safely be received; first, that supposing the fortunes of the Roman world and Christendom from St. John's time to be the subject, the eras chosen for delineation would be the most important and eventful; and next, that the emblems introduced would be suitable to the era and the subject, and in a considerable measure characteristic and distinctive. And again, its subject is assumed, in another place, to be "the continuous fortunes of the Church and the world from St. John's time to the end of all things." Here the objection is raised, that "the whole is reared on the old and mischievous basis of hypothesis, irrespective of even a general survey of the ground to be explored;" just as the Ptolemaic system was founded, and afterwards proved to be false, when tested by inductive philosophy. All *à priori* presumptions, it is thought, are to be deprecated in the investigation of truth; while the true presumptions are the very reverse, since all prophecies of the Old Testament pass by the times of the Gospel in silence, and await the times of Israel's restoration. This legitimate presumption is then unfolded, through nearly one-third of the whole argument, and is said to furnish four main principles, for our guidance in the interpretation of the Apocalypse.

Now if all presumptions are mischievous, and opposed to the sound maxims of inductive inquiry, it is surely very unwise to spend so much time and pains in the attempt to establish an opposite presumption in favour of the Futurist exposition. After all, it seems that presumptions, in the abstract, are not an evil, but only such as clash with our own favourite views.

The whole objection, however, is doubly and entirely groundless; both in its general principle, and in its application to the Horæ, and the usual course of Apocalyptic interpretation. And first, it is quite untrue in its general principle. Some previous hypothesis is needful in almost

Digitized by Google

every step of inductive inquiry. Presumptive evidence needs, almost in every case, to prepare the way of exact and full inquiry. This is plain in our own jurisprudence, and the appointment of grand juries is a practical and hourly commentary on the truth. The Ptolemaic system only confirms and illustrates the same principle. In its own day, it was really the ripest fruit of inductive inquiry, as much as the Newtonian system in our own times. Hipparchus and Ptolemy, to whom we owe it, were not loose theorists, but the most accurate and careful observers of ancient times; and their tables, for long ages, were the nearest approach to a correct view of the heavenly motions. The very writers who declaim against presumptions, are often the most ready to embrace and amplify them, when they think them favourable to their own system.

Next, in its immediate reference to the Horæ, and similar works, the objection is equally baseless. The presumption, here referred to, is in reality only a postulate, assumed for convenience of arrangement, while the question is fully and closely discussed in another place. Mr. Elliott has elsewhere given his reasons, at great length, for rejecting both the Preterist and the Futurist systems, not only in his Preface, but in two distinct supplements of considerable extent. To place this discussion in the forefront of a work designed for general readers, would be as unnatural and unwise, as to prefix to every almanac an abridgment of the "Principia," and a laboured proof of the Newtonian system. Hence no charge can be more destitute of the least shadow of truth, than the one thus carelessly advanced, that he has neglected even "a general survey of the ground to be explored." As for the two maxims themselves, whoever objects to them must be prepared to maintain, either that there is no principle of wise selection in the Divine prophecies, or that it consists with the Divine wisdom to predict trifling changes, rather than the more important, and to choose inappropriate rather than appropriate symbols, to describe them. What person, of any sobriety of thought, will venture on such extravagant assertions? Nothing has less warrant in the fact, than one part of the objection; and nothing can be more unreasonable than the other.

III. Let us now examine the opposite presumption, advanced, though with such evident contradiction to the general maxim, in behalf of the Futurist system. All the prophecies of the Old Testament, it is affirmed, relate only to the national history of Israel. This history is now suspended.

Digitized by Google

The present dispensation forms a parenthesis, passed by in silence in all the elder prophets. Hence it is reasonable to expect a similar break in the Apocalypse, and that it will refer only to events at the coming of the Lord, and the great crisis of Israel's restoration. Since this presumption is the main pillar of the whole scheme, even where all presumptions are condemned as mischievous, it must clearly be held of great force, and therefore calls for an exact inquiry.

1. First, it is natural to inquire, *why* the earlier prophecies all centre around the people of Israel. Was it an accident, or an arbitrary circumstance, in which no principle of God's moral government was involved? This would be a foolish notion, and almost profane. Was it because of their natural descent from Abraham? Clearly not, for then the Ishmaelites, Edomites, and Amalekites, would have been equally conspicuous in the sacred narrative. The true reason is very simple and plain. Israel were then the covenant people of God. So long as they remained the people of the covenant, all Divine prophecy centred around them. But, ever since the days of St. John, the Jews have not been the people of the covenant, but this privilege has been transferred to the visible Church among the Gentiles. The kingdom of God, as our Lord warned the Jews, has been taken from them, and given to others. Hence the very same principle, which made all Old Testament prophecy, from Moses to Malachi, centre in the Jewish nation, *requires* that all New Testament prophecy should centre, not around the Jewish nation, but around the Gentile Church, the actual people of God's covenant, who have been ingrafted in their stead. Such is the voice of reason, and the instinct of every spiritual mind. Hence the appeal to the Old Testament prophets, to support an opposite conclusion, must be utterly vain. To sustain a mere circumstance, it sets aside a main principle of God's moral government, and destroys a fundamental law of Divine revelation. It infers that God will leave His covenant people, for near two thousand years, without any direct light of inspired prophecy, *because* His covenant people always enjoyed that privilege, in a dispensation of dimmer light and less abundant grace.

2. But the Church, it is objected, has not come into the place of Israel, with regard to the earthly standing they enjoyed. "It is apart from any such local or visible condition, as appertaineth and will again appertain to Israel. Nations, as such, are not dealt with by God under this dispensation. With the nations of Christendom, indeed,

Digitized by Google

God is now dealing, but not as nations, but as aggregates of individuals, or visible churches. It is of importance not to confound dispensational truth, but to distinguish between the direct and the indirect, the regular and the incidental. Failure here leads to many mistakes."

Here the attempt to be unusually profound has led to a series of demonstrable contradictions to the truth of Scripture. And first, that the Church has come into the place of Israel is distinctly affirmed by Moses, St. Paul, and our Lord himself, and no ingenuity can set aside their plain and concurrent testimony. (Deut. xxxii. 21; Rom. ix. 21-25; xi. 11-15; Matt. xxi. 43.) Next, that God deals with nations, as nations, in every age alike, is a fundamental truth of Scripture, and to deny it involves a dangerous heresy against the ceaseless dominion and providence of the Almighty. Again, that Israel were dealt with of old, not simply as a nation, but as a holy nation, or a visible Church, set apart for God, is clear from every page of their history. An election were also taken out from among them, as truly as from among the nations of Christendom; and hence the real analogy is the very reverse of what the objection would affirm. Further, if the Church has a heavenly calling, and her children are to be strangers and sojourners on the earth, the very same was true of all pious Israelites, and of the patriarchs their forefathers. (Gen. xxiii. 4; xlvii. 9; Lev. xxv. 23; Ps. xxxix. 12; 2 Chron. xxix. 15.) Also, if Israel were connected with earthly arrangements, the same is true of the Church, until the time of glory shall come. Her trials, helps, duties, hindrances and temptations, all depend on the course of Providence here below. If the hope of the Church is now centred on the Second Advent, so was that of Israel on Messiah's First Coming; and still this did not hinder them from receiving a whole series of prophetic messages, that were partly fulfilled, even before He came. Thus no valid reason can be found, in any feature of contrast between the two dispensations, why the Church should be deprived, for two thousand years, of that special help and light from the word of prophecy, which the Jewish Church enjoyed largely for so many ages before. God's providence is not less real now than in the days of old, nor less profitable to be revealed to His servants, for their guidance and warning, and holy meditation on the ways of the Most High.

3. The present dispensation, it is further alleged, is only a parenthesis. One advocate of the Futurist view has even asserted, that, "although the result has shewn that many

Digitized by Google

centuries have intervened (between the Apostolic age, and the day of Christ), we have no reason to believe that this formed any part of the counsel of God." A doctrine more unscriptural it is surely impossible to conceive. The times of the Gospel may be called a parenthesis, in a certain limited sense, and with reference to the purely Jewish promises. But then, in a sense exactly similar, the whole Mosaic dispensation is itself a parenthesis, between the times of the patriarchs, and of the Christian Church; while the Millennium is another parenthesis, between the dispensation of the Spirit, and the final glory, when the redemption is complete. Viewed apart from such a special reference, the present dispensation is not only one main part of God's eternal counsel of love, but exceeds in dignity and moral grandeur all former ages of the Church before the incarnation of our Lord. It is thus even more natural that some of its main events should be revealed beforehand to the servants of God, than that a similar revelation should have been made by the prophets in those earlier ages of the world.

4. Again, the earlier prophets are not wholly silent respecting this interval, as the objection requires us to believe. Their notices of it are sparing and scanty, because it was still remote, and a premature revelation might have been only perplexing to Jewish believers. It held a similar place, in their messages, to that which the Millennium holds in the New Testament. Still it is not omitted entirely; and nearly all the criticisms by which an opposite view is maintained, against the common faith of the Church, prove themselves, on examination, to be erroneous.

The first of these is on 1 Pet. i. 11, of which a more literal translation is proposed. "Who testified beforehand, unto Christ, the sufferings, and after these, the glories." These sufferings and glories, it is suggested, are "chronological boundaries, or outlines, between which the present, peculiar dispensation was to run its course." The prophets saw and defined these boundaries, but could not discern what lay between them; and hence, the calling of the Gentiles is styled by St. Paul "the mystery which from the beginning of the world had been hid in God."

The emended translation, however, as not seldom is the case, is really less faithful than the common version, since the force of the Greek article is entirely set aside. The most literal, perhaps, would run as follows: "Who testified beforehand the sufferings that pertained to Christ, and the

Digitized by Google

glories that are after these." There is here no mark that there are two chronological limits, but the reverse. The glory of our Lord, as he himself expounds to his disciples, Luke xxiv., followed at once upon his sufferings. The sufferings of his members, which also pertain to him, continue long after his glory has begun; nay, even *their* glory is often described as already begun, even before the time when it is completed in their Lord's Advent. In like manner the prophets clearly announced the resurrection of Christ, and his session at the right hand of the Father, as one main part of "the glories that were to follow." The very passage in Daniel, to which St. Peter chiefly alludes, is fatal to the hypothesis now examined, since it includes many events that belong to the present dispensation.

5. The next passages alleged are Eph. iii. 5, and Rom. xvi. 26. The word, *prophets*, is here explained to denote the apostles themselves, and not the prophets of the Old Testament. But the criticism, in each case, is certainly erroneous. In Eph. iii. 5, the word is not a title of the apostles, but refers to a second and distinct class of inspired teachers in the Church, as will be plain on comparing 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29, and Eph. iv. 11. In Rom. xvi. 26, the expression does relate clearly to the prophetic writings of the Old Testament; as may be proved from the second verse of the Epistle, with which the close forms a kind of parallel, and from many other passages (Acts x. 43; xiii. 27, 29, 32—40; xv. 15—17; xvii. 2, 3, 11; xviii. 28; xxiv. 14; xxvi. 6, 22; xxviii. 23). All these statements prove evidently that the elder prophets were not wholly silent with regard to the events of the present dispensation.

6. It is alleged, further, that Isa. xlix. 6, relates to future times, *after* the recovery of Israel, and that the opposite view is gratuitous and unfounded. Now here, the grammatical force of the word is consistent with either view; but there are several reasons which establish firmly the usual interpretation. The promise to the Messiah is represented as a gracious recompense for the seeming failure of his ministry among the Jews, and hence must naturally follow at once after his rejection by his own people. The kings are to arise, and the princes to worship, at the very time, apparently, when he is still the abhorrence of the nation of Israel. Thirdly, the time of its fulfilment is in the acceptable time, the day of salvation; and this time, St. Paul assures us, was already come in his own days. Finally, St. Paul and Barnabas, by their use of the passage, shew that it contains

Digitized by Google

an express command of God for the first preaching of Christ to the Gentiles. The view, which the objection condemns as gratuitous, they affirm with confidence, to be the very meaning of the Spirit of God. "For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee for a light to the Gentiles that thou shouldest be my salvation to the ends of the earth."

7. A similar criticism is proposed on Luke ii. 32. Only one reason, however, is advanced, to shew that the light of the Gentiles is exclusively to follow the restoration of Israel. The word, *light*, is inferior to the word, *glory;* but the privileges of the elect Church are greater than those of restored Israel. The word αποκαλυψις is also thought to refer to Isa. xxv. 7, and the removal of the veil from all nations, there announced.

Now the simplest rule of exposition is to follow the order of the words, where there is no clear reason to forsake it; and this evidently places "the light of the Gentiles" before "the glory of Israel." The objection has no force whatever, since the word, *light*, is constantly used in the New Testament to describe the present privilege of the Gentile Church. The comparison relates, not to the relative dignity of these two classes in the kingdom of God, but to fulness of objective light successively dispensed upon earth, now to Gentile nations, and hereafter to restored Israel. The climax, in this view, is just and accurate. The word αποκαλυψις is also directly applied Eph. i. 17, 18, to the present privileges of the Gentiles; and hence the simple exposition, which results from the order of the passage, is free from every shadow of real objection, and may be safely affirmed to be the true meaning.

IV. Another argument for the Futurist view of the Apocalypse is derived from the maxim, that to be conversant with times and seasons is a privilege which belongs to the Jews only. This is inferred from 1 Thess. v. 1, compared with Acts i. 6. The restoration of the kingdom to Israel belongs to the earthly things, and will renew the progress of the sacred Jewish festivals, which has been stopped by the present dispensation. And hence the Apocalypse, which teems with references to the times and seasons, can only relate to the still future period of Israel's restoration.

It is hard to grapple with arguments like these, where one unproved hypothesis is piled upon another. We are told, in the course of the same argument, that the apostles on the Mount of Olives represent a Jewish remnant in the last days, and that this remark is the key to that whole prophecy.

Digitized by Google

Here, however, we are taught the exact converse; that in Acts i. 6, they represent the whole Gentile Church, exclusive of the Jews, whose sole and peculiar privilege it is to know the times and seasons. How is it possible to contend with reasons so shadowy, which change their form and colour, like the hues of the camelion, or the clouds of the sky? The apostles, and the Gentile Church whom alone they are to represent, having just before represented only the Jewish remnant, are not to know the times and the seasons, because the order of the Jewish festivals is suspended by the new dispensation. And yet these words of our Lord were spoken to them only ten days before the great day of Pentecost, when those festivals were being observed, perhaps more fully than ever! The whole argument is made up of three or four fancies, contradictory to each other and to the plain facts of Scripture. The simple truth is, that the apostles, from whom our Lord withheld the times and seasons, were Jews, not Gentiles; and that the seven churches, to whom the Apocalypse, "teeming with a reference to the times and seasons," was given, were Gentiles, not Jews; a strange foundation for the theory that such knowledge was to be the exclusive privilege of Jews only.

V. A direct argument for the same general view of the prophecy is endeavoured to be drawn from its title, the Revelation of Jesus Christ. This is explained to mean, "the Personal Appearing of Christ at the Second Advent." The phrase, it is said, never denotes truth derived *from* Christ as the revealer, but only his personal manifestation. To maintain this opinion, the passage Gal. i. 12—17 is explained by a parenthesis as follows:—"Neither was I taught it but by revelation of Jesus Christ. . . . . For I went into Arabia, that is, in order to receive this revelation." Hence Rev. i. 9, is supposed to mean that St. John went to Patmos in order to receive the Divine vision of his Lord. The common view, that St. John was banished, is said to rest merely on tradition; and that, at all events, the Holy Spirit has not deemed it worthy of notice, but assigns as the cause *his own* end, that the prophet might receive and record the visions. It is absurd to say that St. John was banished to Patmos on account of things which he saw in Patmos; and yet the author of the Horæ has fallen into this blunder from not comparing verses 2 and 9, and from his usual haste in rushing to a preconceived opinion, without weighing the text. The testimony of Jesus Christ is named again Rev. xii. 17, and is probably an intimation, that after the rapture of the saints,

Digitized by Google

a Jewish remnant of the last days will have this Book of Revelation, to expose the diabolical plots with which they will have to contend.

In this argument, every criticism is a mistake, and every step involves some form of false reasoning. It is true that the Revelation of Jesus Christ probably denotes here, as in so many other places, one of which He is the object, and not simply the revealer. But the main question is, to what appearance or revelation does it really refer? To say, the Appearance in the Second Advent, perverts the whole passage into mere nonsense. How strange would be such a paraphrase —"the Appearing of the Lord in the last Advent, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass, and he sent and signified it by his angel to his servant John!" The appearance mentioned was clearly past when the words were written. It consisted in a series of visions, presented by the angel to the eye of the prophet, while its very purpose implies that God's servants are still in a state of probation, and not entered into their rest. In a word, it is plainly that revelation of Christ, which is detailed in the first and following chapters, and where he reveals himself as the Great Bishop of the Church, the Lamb of God, the Angel of the Covenant, and the exalted Son of man. On this view the phrase is consistent and harmonious, while the other turns it into a manifest contradiction and absurdity.

Still, the phrase is not always used for an ecstatic revelation. In Ephesians i. 17 it refers to the spiritual manifestation of Christ in the hearts of believers. The gloss proposed in Gal. i. 12—17 is so evidently groundless as to render a full refutation needless. The revelation of Jesus Christ is explained by the words that follow, "It pleased God to reveal his Son in me," which preceded, and did not follow the journey into Arabia. It may possibly be true that the apostle had visions there, as in other places; but if so, it is certain that the Holy Spirit has passed them by in total silence. The revelation was spiritual in its nature, since it took place within the apostle's heart. The journey is mentioned only to prove that he was not taught by man, and had no communication, for a long time, with the other apostles.

The rest of the argument is composed of two evident errors. First the words of ver. 9, "δια τον λογον," denote, not the final end, but *the previous cause*, of the abode in Patmos. Professor Stuart, whose judgment has much weight in a question of mere grammar, speaks as follows:—"There is

Digitized by Google

not a passage in the New Testament which will fairly sustain the other sense of "διa," nor is any allowed either by Winer or Kuhner in their New Testament grammars. Everything in the passage is unnatural when viewed in such a light, and neither grammar nor congruity allows us so to explain it." (i. 260.) "To say, as some have done, that John went to Patmos in order to preach there, or to write the Apocalypse, is virtually renouncing the ascertained meaning of language, and cannot, therefore, have any good claim to credit. In fact, the suggestion that John went to Patmos to write the Apocalypse is so improbable on the very face of it, as not to deserve any serious refutation." (ii. 38.)

Such, then, is the real ground on which the learned author of the Horæ has been charged with a blunder, and rushing precipitately to a conclusion without examining the text. It is only because he has adhered both to grammar and common sense; while the brother, who has rashly censured him, has first violated the grammatical meaning, and then, on the basis of this error, has adopted an exposition as unreasonable in itself, as it is opposed to the uniform tradition of early times.

But this error in grammar is followed by an equal, and, perhaps, still greater error of reasoning. Because, in ver. 2, "the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ" are in apposition with the phrase, "all things which he saw," it is inferred that they denote the Apocalypse in ver. 9 and in chap. xii. 17, also. This strange argument will prove equally that the martyrs were all slain, in order to write or read the Apocalypse after their death, for the same phrase occurs again in chap. xx. Surely the least thought would show that "the word of God" and "the testimony of Jesus Christ" are general expressions, that will apply to a thousand particular forms of written or oral testimony. To confine them to the Apocalypse only, where they are not directly so applied by the context itself, is an error almost astounding; as unreasonable in the abstract, as the conclusions to which it would lead are grotesque and absurd. The view of the passage in the Horæ is critically exact in every part, consistent with grammar, with historical evidence, and sound reason; while the view advanced in its stead with an unbecoming confidence, when tried by any and every test, is entirely erroneous. St. John, it is plain, was banished to Patmos on account of his previous testimony to Christ; and, while there, he received a further message, in angelic visions, by which his testimony might be enlarged and extended to distant ages of time.

VI. Another argument for the restricted reference of the

Digitized by Google

prophecy has been drawn from the seventh verse. This is thought to be a motto of the whole, by which the nature of its contents may be determined; and that it refers to the coming of our Lord, not *with* his saints, but *for* them, as shewn by the added clause, "they also which pierced Him," where the reference is to the Jewish nation. The same view is taken of Matt. xxiv., where the apostles are assumed to represent a Jewish remnant in the last days. In v. 30 we have the solemn announcement, which John repeats in the Apocalypse. "It is the coming of Christ to the earthly people, the Jews, at a particular crisis of their history."

Here, again, every part is mere assumption, and assumption of the most fanciful and unreasonable kind, directly opposed to the instinctive feeling of every simple and unbiassed reader. The verse, Rev. i. 7, has no more claim to be viewed as the motto of the book, than those which precede and follow it. Indeed, if the coming of Christ is the great event in which all the visions terminate, and the main object of hope and desire through all the previous delay, the exclamation is fully explained, and is in complete harmony with the larger interpretation of the prophecy: while, on this view, the words that follow become far more natural and expressive. If the whole range of providence, from the time of St. John until the coming of the Lord, centres in His person, and is equally revealed in the prophecy, how suitable does the inscription appear—"I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty."

Again, the idea that the coming announced relates exclusively to the Jews, after the rapture of the saints, is most unnatural. The apostle plainly contemplates that great and solemn event, as a whole, but with especial reference to his own hope, and that of his fellow-christians. It is explained afterward to be the coming, wherein our Lord will render a reward to the righteous and the holy, and fulfil the deep longing of the Spirit and the Bride. The other passage, Matt. xxiv., only confirms this view, instead of opposing it. For it is afterward that the elect are gathered, with the sound of the angel's trumpet, into the presence of their Lord. It is the duty of every one, who prizes the Scriptures, to set his face strongly against this factitious and fanciful style of interpretation; which, to sustain some minute, wiredrawn theory, does violence to the plainest lessons of the context, and destroys the moral simplicity and grandeur of the messages of God.

Digitized by Google

VII. The last argument for the new system, and one supposed to be of vast importance, is founded on those words of the Apostle, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's-day." In the Horæ, as in every critic and commentator for more than seventeen centuries, these words are taken in their simple and natural meaning, that, on a certain Lord's-day, St. John was in a spiritual trance or ecstasy, and saw these celestial visions. In a supplement, however, the novel hypothesis, first thrown out by Dr. Maitland, that the Lord's-day denotes here the day of the Advent, is more directly alluded to, and is justly termed "a sleight of hand, that sets language, grammar, and context alike at defiance." This language is complained of, as impatient and magisterial in its tone. The other view, it is thought, is an arresting interpretation, and one the merits of which ought to be examined for the truth's sake; a clue to be patiently pursued, and not disdainfully cast away. The allegation of inconsistencies, arising from pre-conceived notions of the Revelation, has nothing to do with the simple, preliminary question, of the meaning of the phrase. To entertain this question would be very inconvenient to the whole system of the more usual interpretations, and utterly explode them from the mind of God's children.

The complaints thus expressed are not a little unreasonable. Mr. Elliott simply adheres to a view of the passage, which has been held by every father, commentator, critic, and general reader, perhaps without an exception, from the earliest that are extant, until within the last thirty years. Since, however, another view has been started by a few writers of late; though he accounts it as baseless as it is novel, he devotes more than two closely-printed pages to its refutation. Of course, all those who account this novelty a discovery of vast importance, cannot agree with the arguments that explode it, however decisive; but it is too much to expect that others should treat this thoroughly novel, and as they believe, thoroughly false interpretation, held only by one or two writers, with the same respect as a plausible exposition, that has long shared the preference of exact critics, and thoughtful and profound divines. But since there are still some who venture seriously to maintain this new version, and even regard it as an important discovery, it may be well to examine it anew. The censure, passed upon it in the Horæ, will perhaps be found not in the least more severe than truth and equity demand.

1. The first question is one of direct usage, and lies in a narrow compass. "*No instance has ever been adduced where η κυριακη ημερα denotes the day of judgment. In every known*

Digitized by Google

example of its use, it denotes the Lord's-day, or Christian Sabbath."

Instances are given, in the Horæ, from Irenæus, from Clemens (Str. vii. 12), from Theophilus, about A.D. 150 (B. P. M. II. P. II. p. 171); from Melito, who wrote a treatise περι κυριακης, and was Bishop of *Sardis*, in the second century, just eighty years after the date of the prophecy; from Origen, and Dionysius of Corinth; and in its Latin equivalent, from Tertullian and Commodian. All of these were before the time of Constantine, and the earliest only about fifty years after the death of St. John. It is also adopted as the regular and usual term, in the Paschal Canon of Hippolytus, in the first year of Alexander Severus, A.D. 222. Since then its use has plainly been universal, both in the Greek and Latin Churches. No one has been able to adduce a solitary example, where it is employed in a different meaning. Unless, therefore, we may vary the sense of words, to suit the passing fancies of every expositor, we must explain the phrase, as Christians have always hitherto done, to denote the first day of the week, or the Christian Sabbath.

But it is urged that "the phrase occurs in no other part of Scripture to denote the Christian Sabbath, and that *the first day of the week* is the term uniformly employed; nor is it even contended that it was used by the fathers in this sense before the close of the second century." This onesided statement, however, will never satisfy any candid inquirer. The simple fact is, that it never occurs in Scripture in *any* sense, except in this passage; and that it never occurs in the Christian writers, except in the one sense of the Christian Sabbath; that this usage is actually proved as high as the middle, not the close of the second century, or within the lifetime of St. John's contemporaries; and we have clear proofs that soon afterwards it was in constant use, and a standard ecclesiastical term. Hence it is contended, with the highest reason, that it was used by the fathers and other Christians from the very time of St. John; and even earlier, since it would naturally result from the facts of the resurrection, and their deep, habitual reverence for their risen Lord. The argument, from usage alone, is therefore clear and decisive.

2. Again, *no instance is found in all Scripture where a prophet speaks of himself, or is spoken of by others, as transported into a distant time.* Abraham is said to have seen the day of Christ afar off, but not to have been transported into it. Neither in Isaiah, Daniel, nor any other prophet, can one example be found of such a strange idiom. The new exposi-

Digitized by Google

tion not only contradicts the meaning of the word, in every known instance of its occurrence, but introduces a solecism of phrase, for which there is no warrant nor parallel in the whole range of the inspired word of God.

3. Thirdly, the context is equally decisive against the novel version. As justly observed in the Horæ, it makes the judgment day the subject of all that follows, "including first and foremost the epistles to the seven then existing Churches themselves." What indeed can be more absurd than the resulting paraphrase? "I was transported in Spirit, two thousand years onward, into the time of the Lord's Second Advent, and heard a voice saying, What thou seest write in a book, and send it to the seven churches, in Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, and Laodicea." No contradiction could be more intolerable.

The only way in which this incongruity can be avoided, and the hypothesis still sustained, is by transporting the Seven Churches themselves into the last times. When such a view can be embraced, it is almost time to suspend all reasoning, and rather to pray that God may restore the spirit of a sound mind to those who can wander so far from the plain meaning of the text. In behalf of this strange and wild notion, a criticism no less strange has been offered. "St. John," it is said, "writes to the Seven Churches in Asia, not which *are* in Asia, and thus leaves the time to be future, if the case requires it. This may be a special provision of God for that end, since a peculiar preciseness obtains in the inscription of the ordinary epistles—to all that *be* in Rome—to the Church of God which *is* in Corinth, and so with the other epistles. The phrase leaves thus the future application possible, and the allusions in the context render it indispensable."

This is a startling example, how far the bias of a favourite hypothesis may lead men astray from the clearest truths. And first, the contrast asserted is quite imaginary. The form used by St. Paul in Galatians, Colossians, and Thessalonians, and by the other apostles in every case, is just the same as in the inscription to the Seven Churches. Next, the presence or absence of the participle, which must be implied even where not expressed, can never affect the plain truth, that the Seven Churches, to which the apostle was personally to send the book, were in actual existence at the time. It is probable that no instance can be found, in a similar case, where the Greek idiom allows an ellipsis of the future participle, while that of the present participle occurs thousands of times.

Digitized by Google

Lastly, the mark of time present, in this chapter, is far more decisive than even in St. Paul's own inscriptions; since *the things which are* are expressly identified with the epistles to the Churches, and are contrasted with *the things which shall be hereafter*. Hence the whole statement, though claiming to be the result of greater accuracy of observation, is nothing else than a congeries of strange and manifest errors.

4. The new construction *violates the Greek idiom.* As observed in the Horæ, it requires us to translate the verb substantive, with a dative, as if it were a verb of motion, with an accusative. It is replied that a verb of motion is used with an ablative, 1 Tim. iii. 16, and that it need not be taken as a verb of motion, but quite simply—"I was, in the Spirit, in the Lord's-day." But the whole reply depends on a misconception of the argument. A verb of motion, it is true, may be joined with a dative, but the accusative is required always for the *terminus* or limit of the motion, and the passage in Timothy is no exception to the rule. Again, if no motion be expressed, the words will not convey the desired meaning, but revert of course to their usual sense. "I was in the Spirit in the Lord's-day," will seem, to any plain reader, a slight deviation from the correct English idiom; but will still suggest the notion of the actual day of the vision, and not of a transfer to some remote period of time, after two thousand years.

5. The previous verse confirms the usual exposition. One verse plainly defines the place, and the other the time, where and when the visions were revealed, "I was in the isle called Patmos,—I was in the Spirit on the Lord's-day." The resemblance is manifest, and the symmetry of the statement as much requires us to believe that the Lord's-day was the actual time of the visions, as that Patmos was really the place where the apostle was privileged to behold them.

6. The contrast with vi. 2, proves still further the falsehood of the novel interpretation. The expression there stands simply, "I was in the Spirit," and here with an added circumstance, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's-day." But, on the proposed view of its meaning, the additional words should have been absent in the former passage, and have appeared only in the second. For the epistles are clearly, and by our Lord's own statement, of time present; even if all the purely prophetic visions, from chap. iv., were referred to the future Advent. On this hypothesis the phrase, "on the Lord's-day," is absent, where it might appear with entire consistency; and is inserted, where it could only serve to perplex

Digitized by Google

and confound all our ideas of time. The very order in which the words occur is a further evidence of the same truth, when we compare them with xvii. 4, "he carried me away into the wilderness in spirit."

7. Lastly, the analogy of Scripture usage confirms the reference of the words to the Christian Sabbath. The adjective, *κυριακος*, occurs only in one other place, 1 Cor. xi. 20, in the words, "this is not to eat the Lord's supper" (*ουκ εστι κυριακον δειπνον φαγειν*). It is there used with reference to a sacred and continually recurring ordinance of the Church, instituted in memory of a remarkable event in our Lord's personal history. Its use in the Apocalypse, on the common interpretation, is precisely the same. The *cœna dominica* is a sacred meal, which continually commemorates the Saviour's death; and the *dies dominica*, by parity of meaning, is a sacred day, which continually commemorates His glorious resurrection.

The occurrence of the phrase, here only, is easily explained on this view. For the Jewish Sabbath, as is plain from our Lord's prophecy, continued partly in force among the disciples till the fall of Jerusalem. And hence, although the first day began to be set apart for a sacred use, ever since the Lord arose, it was not unnatural that its formal consecration to replace the old Sabbath, by a new title of honour, should be delayed until the Jewish desolation was begun. We find it, therefore, at the opening of the Apocalypse, and here only; while, if the phrase denoted the Second Advent, no good reason can be given for this solitary deviation from the customary forms of expression.

8. Only one reason, of any seeming weight, is offered for the other view. In 1 Cor. iii. 13, the day of Christ is said to be *revealed* by fire; and the apostle then adds presently, as if in contrast, "With me it is a very small thing to be judged of you, or of man's day" (*υπο ανθρωπινης ημερας*). It is argued that man's day, and the Lord's-day are in direct antithesis, and the form of expression the very same; and hence that the Lord's-day, which St. John beheld in spirit, is a contrast to the day of man, for which St. Paul cared so little.

But even this solitary argument, though plausible at the first glance, disappears on closer inquiry. First, the apostle in the same passage, speaks repeatedly of the day of judgment; and yet never once employs the adjective form, *η κυριακη ημερα*, which he adopts in reference to the day of

Digitized by Google

man. Hence we may infer that it did not really suggest to his mind the same idea. Again, the other phrase is not collective, but distributive. It denotes any judgment passed by any mortal man, in the transitory course of this present life; so that it might be rendered accurately "or by any human day." It is not a term for the whole duration of the world, but for any portion of it occupied by any individual in his own lifetime. Since, then, it is really a multiple term, and refers to time past, it is parallel with the Lord's-day, in its usual acceptation, and is not parallel with the one great day of the Lord. Instead of disproving the ordinary translation of Rev. i. 10, the passage, when more rigidly examined, serves only to yield a still further testimony of its truth.

Thus, finally, whether we consider the universal meaning of the phrase in other places, the total want of any Scripture parallel for the suggested idiom, and for the imaginary transfer of a prophet to a distant time; the plain evidence of the context, in the date of the Seven Churches; the grammatical force of the words themselves; their resemblance to the former verse, which defines the *place* of the vision, as these denote its actual time; and again, to the opening of the fourth chapter; or whether we examine the use of the same adjective, in Corinthians, to denote the Lord's Supper, a standing ordinance of an exactly similar kind; all conspire to vindicate the interpretation which has been received by unbroken consent from the earliest times, and proves that the Lord's-day, when St. John was in the Spirit, was really the first day of the week, or the Christian Sabbath, which has retained that very title through every age of the Church of Christ.

Art. VI.—THE SIGNS.

We are much in the habit in these days, of speaking of "signs," but we might as well ask how far we are affixing a full and right meaning to the word or the thing. Perhaps it might be found that we were contenting ourselves with but *half* the exposition of it. There may be more in God's "signs of the times" than we have been counting on. The vagueness with which they have been interpreted has robbed them of half their significance and fulness.

Digitized by Google

Many a sign has of late been hung out in heaven and exhibited on earth. And we do well to read them with solemn carefulness. Woe be to the Church that slights these heaven-lighted signals of warning and guidance! Self-righteousness, self-confidence closed the eyes of the Jewish Church against the signs of the earlier times, drawing forth from the Lord the keen rebuke, "Ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky, and can ye not discern the signs of the times?" It will be well if no Laodicean pride and self-sufficiency blind the eye of the Christian Church in these latter days.

These signs are not mere dark tokens of coming evil or coming good, so that a man, looking at them as they gleam above, or listening to their ominous sound as they roll beneath, may say, "Ah, something terrible or something glorious must be nigh." They are more than this. They are truly *significant* in the broadest sense of the word. They point determinately and directly to certain things as ere long to come to pass; each sign, as with its ebon wand, pointing out something special—something in thorough correspondence or contrast with itself. For these signs are not so much the terminating threads of a web woven and finished during these six thousand years, as the loose threads of the mighty web which is just about to be begun—the dark edging or selvage of that mightier fabric that is to spread over eternity. The shadows that we see in these days are not shadows cast from a setting sun behind, but from a rising sun in front; not shadows gathering new depth and sadness from the murky sky of this dark age, but shadows brought out in sharp yet awful relief by gleams from the approaching glory of the brighter age to come.

Let us look at a few of our modern signs in the more definite way we speak of. We shall, it may be, discover the precise things or objects to which they are pointing. We shall see in them so many diverse lines of evil which God is allowing to run out to their *extremity*, and then, at that extremity, meeting them with new lines of contrasting good, making the world to feel, at the last, most solemnly what it has all along been made in some measure to see, that man's extremity is God's opportunity.

I. *Disorganization.* To what does this sign point? To consolidation in the age to come. This disorganization, or disintegration, or decomposition, or by whatever name it may be called, has, to a most appalling extent, transfused itself

Digitized by Google

through all kingdoms and communities. Not as if this were wholly new. It has been long at work, but secretly. The fabric was undermined, corroded, as we can suppose some mighty vessel to be by the silent operation of myriads of insects. The shock came, and forthwith the whole began to crumble down. That shock did not produce the decomposition; it only laid it bare and helped forward the process. So extensive, so all-pervading is the evil, that men can but look helplessly on, awaiting the awful issue. For this is a kind of evil for which man knows no remedy. He has no mould in which to recast the disintegrated rocks of earth.

An appalling sign this, if man could but realize the desperate evil which it reveals! Yet it is a sign which is pointing to the contrasting good, and the more the decomposing process spreads and ramifies, the more surely do we know that we are nearing that age in which that process shall not only be checked but reversed, and stability, consolidation, incorruption, be the universal law.*

II. *Individualism.* Man is isolating himself from his fellow-man, seeking the things of self. All ties, domestic and social, are untwining themselves, and each man will soon be seen standing alone. Selfism or individualism will soon be consummated, and this will pass over into its worst or extreme feature—hostility to all around—realizing the apostle's picture, "hateful and hating one another."

Some in our day are willing to lay this evil at the door of the Reformation. Most untruly and unjustly. The Reformation established *personality*, not *individualism.* It only isolated man as touching the *conscience*, bringing out separate responsibility—responsibility admitting of no transference to a church or a priest. But selfism it repudiated.

* In the report of the Meeting of the British Association there is a notice of Col. Sykes' paper, "*On Atmospheric Disturbances throughout the World*," and on a remarkable storm at Bombay on 6th April, 1848. This paper is interesting on account of the view taken of these phenomena. The "Atheneum" says, "It characterizes the atmospheric disturbances and anomalies which presented themselves in various places in Europe, Asia, Africa, and even America for some months past, as *not less remarkable than the political agitations and storms* which swept over Europe lately. Of these it gives ample details, collected from various sources. It particularizes the ice and snow in Poonah, and the extreme cold at Bombay, Simla, and other places in the East Indies, *as quite a miracle.* It traces the contemporaneous state of public health." Is this a literal fulfilment of "the vial *poured out into the air*," giving a basis to the prophetic symbol, and indicating physical processes as now going on in the atmosphere, corresponding to the moral and social ones at work on the earth?

Digitized by Google

What, however, is this sad sign of our age pointing to,—this individualism which is breaking the human family into fragments, or rather atoms, and setting each against his fellow like hungry wolves? *Brotherhood!* The blessed brotherhood of the age to come. Then the lost links of creaturehood shall be sought out and refastened. Then the living fragments of the mighty family shall attract each other, and man embrace his fellow in kindly indestructible embrace. This dark line of individualism has nearly reached its extremity, and when it does so, it passes off, and is succeeded by God's own line of blessed unity and peace. Most distinctly does this evil of our age point forward to the contrasting good in the dispensation to come, foretelling an age of brotherhood—when man, without losing personality, shall yet re-assume the lost oneness of the race—a oneness of ever-circulating love and sympathy.

III. *Dispersion.* The families of earth have not only been broken up, but scattered over earth;—nay, intermingled with each other, as the leaves of each various forest-tree, oak, or fir, or cedar, lie mixed with each other on the autumn plain or hollow. Nations, tribes, families have been torn into fragments, and these fragments scattered over the globe, irrecoverably disordered.

Was this God's purpose? Intermingling, to a certain extent, may have been so; but not the strange disorder that now exists. And may we not conclude that the age of gathering and re-ordering is yet to come—the age when not only Israel shall re-appear from her long scattering, but other nations, other families shall again draw together and reassume the family or the national oneness which God designed they should possess and preserve? And does not the present condition of the human race seem to call for some such re-ordering—nay, point forward to the time when this re-ordering, this re-marshalling, shall take place among the spared nations of the earth?

IV. *Insubordination.* Men are everywhere champing the bit, if they have not cast it from them altogether. They will rule—they will not be ruled! Each man must be a monarch, and there shall be no subjects, no subordinates. It is very clear that this wild spirit of evil is gathering fearful strength. It is no passing outburst of pent-up vengeance—no hurricane of human passion that will storm across the earth and then subside into deeper calm. No. It is the rooted, seated, deliberate determination of men no longer to be ruled! It is not mere hatred of ranks, nor envy of a

Digitized by Google

jewelled crown. It is the dark resolution henceforth to obey no law and to yield to no authority. The issue of this it is not difficult to foresee. Our master-poet has put into the lips of Ulysses a description of what we may expect.

> Take but degree away, untune that string,
> And hark what discord follows! Each thing meets
> In mere oppugnancy; the bounded waters
> Should lift their bosoms higher than the shores,
> And make a sop of all this solid globe;
> Strength should be lord of imbecility,
> And the rude son should strike his father dead.
> Force should be right, or rather right and wrong
> Should lose their names, and so should justice too.
> Then everything includes itself in power,
> Power into will, will into appetite;
> And appetite, an universal wolf,
> So doubly seconded with will and power,
> Must make, perforce, an universal prey,
> And last eat up himself.

Is not Europe in the process of realizing this picture? Utter insubordination, insubjection to the powers that be or to any powers at all, is the spirit of the times and the nations. The flood is rising every hour. In its swell it has already lifted up and torn from their moorings some thrones of earth; it will, as it rises, do the same for all. What anchor can hold a vessel in such a rising deluge? What foundation, however stable, can resist being washed away?

To what then, does this sign point? To the kingdom that cannot be moved. The age of order is at hand. The era of obedience is waiting to begin its cycle. When that disorder and insubordination shall have run its course, exhausting itself while it lays waste the earth, then, at the fiat of the coming King, order arises; and obedience—willing, glad obedience—circulates through earth. It is not a *republic* but a *monarchy* that we are expecting—a monarchy of which Christ is the one King, with his risen saints seated round him on the throne, ruling in righteousness over an obedient earth, into which no voice of sedition or disaffection can enter, and where no clamour for reform can find a place, for all is perfect, the kingdom and the King, the prosperity, the peace, the joy!

We might proceed, but these four points will suffice. They illustrate, and, we trust, demonstrate the statement with which we set out. They may also lead to thoughts of yet wider range, if some of our readers will but take the trouble to begin the search.

Digitized by Google

These various lines (they are not four, but forty times four) of evil are manifestly hurrying onward with alarming swiftness. All hail to their impetuous speed! The crisis will come the sooner, and after the crisis come the glory and the joy. Rugged splendour at first; when the light battles with the darkness, ere the victory is made sure; but splendour widening and broadening till the whole earth rejoices in unclouded day. Troubled waters at first; when the two tides are meeting; but the conflict soon ceases, the swell subsides, and the eternal calm spreads out over the long vexed deep.

LETTERS TO AN INQUIRER.

Letter I.

FAIR-DEALING WITH THE SCRIPTURES.

My Dear Friend,—We may corrupt the word of God not only by mis-stating a doctrine, but by *mis-placing* it. We are not only to receive the truths of God, but we must receive them in His *order*. A departure from this is a rejection of His purpose, and an injury done to the truth itself. We are no more at liberty to adjust the order, than to sit in judgment on the truth itself. Both the truth and its order must be entirely God's, not man's.

Nor is the order of little moment. It matters much. The unfolding of God's purposes is concerned in it. The development of his great idea of the universe turns as much on the *order* of events, as on the events themselves. Events thrown confusedly together cannot bring out the thoughts and ends of God in creation or in providence.

Destroy the order of the lines in "Paradise Lost,"—huddle them together by chance, or according to the fancy of some child who understands neither their meaning nor their beauty,—and what becomes of the poem? Disarrange the order of the stars, and though you may not rob any one of them of a single ray, yet you have marred God's firmament. Alter the position of the notes in some sweet melody, and though each note remains in itself the same, yet the weetness of the melody is gone. It is melody no more.

Just so is it with the truths of God. Their *order* is as much to be examined and adjusted, as their individual verity.

Digitized by Google

If I alter the position of one of them, I mar the whole. As soon as the *order* is disturbed, the utterance of each is falsified. Nay, the utterance of the whole immediately becomes confused and unmeaning. So that accuracy as to the position or order of a truth, is of as much importance as accuracy as to the truth itself. The relationships of one truth to all others on every side are so close and manifold, that it is difficult to overrate the importance of a proper arrangement. *Every* truth may be said to suffer from the misplacement of *one*.

This is one of the considerations that add much to the importance of the question regarding the pre-millennial advent of the Lord. If there be any truth in my statements above, then there can be no compromise on this point. I must not allow it to be said, "Oh, do not lay so much stress upon the *order* of events; be content that we all believe in the Millennium and in the Advent, and let time settle the order." No. I am persuaded that much depends upon this *order*. It must not be slighted. It must not be tampered with. The mis-placement of either of these events may be the entire derangement of God's purpose. On the right relative adjustment may depend the illustration and development of infinite truths.

From not considering this, some I fear, have been led to remain neutral in the controversy. They see the scandal attached to pre-millennialism. They have magnified the difficulties connected with it; and though not prepared to oppose it, they shrink from embracing it. And in order to lay to rest the stirrings of an uneasy conscience, they persuade themselves that the *order* of events is of less moment, provided the events themselves be received.

This method of evading or postponing a decision, is inadmissible. No one is entitled to say that the *order* of events is a matter of minor importance. The root must be before the stem, the stem before the branches, the branches before the leaves, the leaves before the blossoms, the blossoms before the fruit. There is an order in natural things which cannot be dispensed with,—an order which is of the first importance. And so in spiritual things. There is an order there which is equally indispensable, equally necessary to the development of God's purpose or idea. It is rash, it is profane to treat this *order* as a point of subordinate importance; and especially to do so, that thus the necessity and duty of a prompt decision may be disproved, or set aside.

But I have observed another class, in reference to whom I

Digitized by Google

may say, that they err not so much by positive misplacement as by *omission.* They allow the Millennium to drop altogether out of their creed. They point to the Advent as the Church's hope; they do not admit of any lengthened period between us and that Advent. So far they say well. But then they shrink from a Millennium after the Advent. They dislike the thought of a state, in any form or degree, imperfect, after Christ has come, or when he is reigning. They cannot think that there can be sin or death during such a reign, or any outbreak of evil at its close; and hence they have come to the conclusion that there is no such thing as a Millennium at all. I do not suppose that this is a large class. But I know that there are some, of whom such is the belief. It is a belief taken up for the purpose of getting rid of what they count the objectionable or unnatural features of Millenarianism. By this view, they hope to make their prophetic creed more reasonable as well as more palatable.

But do they make it more scriptural? No. They only entangle themselves in more hopeless error. A Millennium, —a period of blessedness on earth, ere its affairs are finally wound up,—is so plainly written over all Scripture, that *very few indeed* attempt to take up the position I have referred to. The omission of that state would be the marring of the mighty plan. It would be the arrestment of one of the most marvellous developments of good and evil which has yet taken place. It would be the complete setting aside of God's purpose, and substituting man's. To *withdraw* the Millennium altogether, for the end of making a more feasible and less objectionable scheme, is altogether inadmissible. If it be not cutting out the keystone itself, it is at least cutting out one of the stones that lie next it. By such an omission God's idea would remain unexpressed, His plan undeveloped and cut short.

Take from the harmony a single tone,
A single tint take from the Iris' bow,
And lo, what once was all, is nothing, while
Fails to the lovely whole one tint or tone.

There is a third class, of whom it may be said, that they err by *diluting* the doctrines of revelation. To a certain extent they correspond with the first class, for they *misplace* as well as *dilute;* and, in a measure also, they might be charged with *omissions;* but their special error is their dilution of the word. They dilute the inspired statements as to the judgments that are to prepare the way for the Millennium; abstracting from them all that is personal, and turning

Digitized by Google

them into mere providences. They dilute the predictions regarding Antichrist and his power. They dilute the predictions respecting the Millennium itself, holding it to be only a considerable improvement upon the present state of things. They dilute the predictions as to the renewal of the earth, and the deliverance of the whole creation during the days of Millennial blessedness. From these dilutions much evil has arisen,—much misunderstanding of God's purpose,—much misinterpretation of Scripture,—and much ignorance of our present position, prospects, and hopes.

I trust that you will consider these statements. They are not hypothetical or fictitious. I write only what I have heard and read. I am persuaded that these three errors lie at the root of all that is erroneous in the various systems and interpretations of anti-millenarianism. Misplacement, omission, or dilution, are charges which might be made good against them. I ask you, my dear friend, to consider how far some one of these might not be charged against the views to which you are at present leaning. Nothing can be misplaced or omitted or diluted without marring the Divine system of truth; and it is therefore of no small moment to be led to inquire how far our system may or may not involve any of these evils.

I am, yours, &c.

Letter II.

INTERPRETATION.

My Dear Friend,—The three errors which I sought to point out to you in my former letter, may be said to involve in them another, more general and applying to all of them, I mean error of *interpretation*. Unless we interpret aright, we cannot fail to misplace, to omit, and to dilute; whereas the surest method of deliverance from these would be, sound interpretation.

Now as to this I ask, how comes it to pass that, seeing we are at no loss to interpret the historical books of Scripture, we should be at such a loss to interpret the prophetical? They are spoken by the same Spirit, in the same language, to the same human ears. Should they not be understood in the same way? Is it fair and right to treat them differently?

You say, perhaps, there is a reason for treating them differently. The one is literal, the other figurative. But

Digitized by Google

this is begging the matter under dispute. It is deciding the very point that is *sub judice*.

I should not hesitate to say that this is a *false* division. The difference between the two kinds of books is far from being what is stated. Much that is historical is figurative, and much that is prophetical is confessedly literal. The figurative and the literal occur plentifully in both; though I at once admit, more plentifully in prophecy than in history.

But admitting the greater amount of *figurativeness* in prophecy than in history, still the principles of exposition are and must be precisely the same. We must use the same means to separate the figurative from the literal; and when the separation has been made, we must use the same means to determine what the figure means. No one is entitled to say,—such a passage occurs in a historical book, and therefore must be literally understood; such another passage occurs in a prophetical book, and must therefore be spiritually understood. It may be easier to make the separation in Genesis than in Isaiah, in Matthew than in the Apocalypse; but the principles on which it is done are precisely the same.

Do you say to me, as many do,—but if you expound one verse or passage in the Apocalypse literally, you must do the same with all; if you make the first resurrection literal, you must make the key and the chain literal. Nay, I answer, not so. I must separate the literal from the figurative here, as everywhere else. I must carefully examine each word to ascertain what is the one, and what is the other. Is not this fair and sound? Perhaps you reply,—No, it is unfair and unsound. You must carry out your literalities, or else forego them. Must we? And do you who oppose us, practise this rule which you press upon us? *You* as well as we find *literalities* in that chapter. May I not insist upon *your* carrying them out? You admit the literality of Satan,—of the judgment,—of the resurrection at the close of the Millennium. Then, according to your own principle, you must carry this literality all through, and admit it in reference to the first resurrection and the reigning. If you demand of us the carrying out of our principles in every verse and word, you must first be consistent and act upon your own rules. Or let me reverse the argument. You say that the first resurrection and reigning are figurative. Be it so. According to your principle, the whole chapter ought to be figurative,—the judgment must be a mere figure, torment must be a figure, the resurrection mentioned in the thirteenth verse, must be a

Digitized by Google

figure. Is it so? Will you contend for this? Would you tolerate this? Would you not call it Rationalism?

But the truth is, this is a false method of arguing on whichever side it be employed. The literalist is not entitled to say to the spiritualist, if you take one verse spiritually you must take the whole spiritually. Nor is the spiritualist entitled to say to the literalist, if you take one verse literally you must take the whole literally. Both of these attempts to reduce an opponent to absurdity are illegitimate.

Why, you may ask? For the following obvious reason. There are certain expressions in the chapter referred to which both parties take literally; and there are others which both take figuratively. Nothing, then, can be gained by an attempt to force either party to an extremity. Each may retort upon the other and no advance is made.

Such being the case, the true and obvious course is to endeavour to fix the limit between the literal and the figurative. The real question before us is not, "is all literal or is all figurative?" Both join in negativing such a question. But, "how much is literal and how much is figurative?" This is a question which must be put separately respecting each verse, or clause. Nor will the difficulty of answering it be found to be very great. It is considerably less than many seem to suppose. Take in illustration of this the fifty-third of Isaiah. In that chapter there is both the literal and the figurative. No one contends that there is nothing figurative in it; neither does any one hold that there is nothing in it of the literal. The aim of commentators is not to retort upon each other the evils of extreme literality or extreme spirituality, but so to interpret each verse as to discover how much is literal and how much is figurative.

This is just the way that we deal with all Scripture. Knowing that all is not figurative and that all is not literal, we try to draw the line which separates the one from the other. And in general we do not find this very difficult to do. Nor do I need to confine this remark to Scripture. This is the way in which we deal with any author,—as, for instance, with Milton or with Cowper. In every page we find both the literal and the figurative; yet who finds any difficulty in discriminating between them and interpreting either of these authors accordingly? *All* is not literal because *some* is literal, and again *all* is not figurative because *some* is figurative. Each passage must be determined by itself; and each passage

Digitized by Google

contains enough in itself or in its context to decide the matter. Take the following from Milton.

> "The rest, far greater part
> Will deem in outward rites and specious forms,
> Religion satisfied; *truth shall retire*
> *Bestuck with slanderous darts;* and works of faith
> Rarely be found: so shall the world go on,
> To good malignant, to bad benign:
> *Under her own weight groaning*, till the day
> Appear of *respiration* to the just
> And vengeance to the wicked, at return
> Of him so lately promised to thy aid
> *The Woman's seed*, obscurely then foretold
> Now amplier known thy Saviour and thy Lord:
> Last, in the clouds, from heaven to be revealed
> In glory of the Father, to dissolve
> Satan with his perverted world, then raise
> From the conflagrant mass, purged and refined,
> New heavens, new earth, ages of endless date
> *Founded in righteousness* and peace and love
> To bring forth fruits, joy and eternal bliss."

In this passage I have marked some of the obviously figurative passages in Italics. Every reader feels that these are figures. He has no difficulty in doing so. Yet does he conclude that therefore the whole passage is a figure throughout? Because it is said that "truth retires, bestuck with slanderous darts," does he conclude that the next clause must be a figure also? Because it is said, in a figure, that the world is groaning under its own weight, must we conclude that it is not the literal world that is meant, and that it is not the literal world that is to be renewed?

Besides, granting that a passage is a figure, the question still remains, of what is it a figure? *It may be a figure of something literal.* It may be intended to *illustrate* the literal, not to *do away* with it. As we read in the thirty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, "the wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them, and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose." Here there is obviously a figure; but is it all a figure and nothing more? Is it not a figure thrown round a literal scene to brighten and beautify it? The wilderness is said to be glad and the desert to rejoice. Here is a figure,—but a figure of what? Of the glad renovation of the literal wilderness. The *wilderness* is not a figure though the joy is a figure. The literal wilderness is turned into a literal paradise, and the gladness is added to the picture to denote the vastness and glory of the change. Or take the ninety-eighth psalm, "let the sea roar and the fulness there-

Digitized by Google

of, the world and they that dwell therein. Let the floods clap their hands, let the hills be joyful together before the Lord, for he cometh to judge the earth." Here are figures as strong as may be. Yet are they not figures employed to set off a *literal* scene? The boldness of the figure, so far from robbing it of its literality, adds greatly to it; so that even after we have admitted a passage to be figurative, we are still at liberty to ask,—"of what is it the figure?" Or take the first chapter of the Lamentations:—

How doth the city sit solitary
The city that was full of people!
She is become a widow.
She was great among the nations,
She was princess among the provinces!
She is become tributary.
She weepeth sore in the night,
And her tears are on her cheeks;
Among all her lovers she hath no comforter!

Here are figures; and strong ones too. Yet who doubts that they are figures of a great literality,—of the literal Jerusalem? The existence of the figures does not make the city a spiritual city, nor her desolation a spiritual desolation, nor her captivity a spiritual captivity. These things remain literal, with however many figures they may be surrounded. So in the twentieth chapter of Revelation. Granting that the *key* is a figure, and the *chain* a figure and the *binding* a figure, does this prove that Satan is not *literal* and that his restraint is not literal? or does it prove that the resurrection is not literal, or that the reign is not literal?

These are points connected with the interpretation of Scripture which we ought most carefully to weigh. For the ideas of many are vague and loose. In speaking of figures or figurative passages, we ought to be sure that we are attaching a definite meaning to the words we use, lest perchance we be confusing ourselves and corrupting the Word of God.

I am, yours, &c.,

August, 1848. ———.

Digitized by Google

Reviews.

The Great Continental Revolution ; marking the Expiration of the Times of the Gentiles, A.D. 1847-8. By J. H. Frere, Esq. London : J. Hatchard and Son. 1848.

Mr. Frere has been for thirty-four years a patient student of the prophetic word. Whether we be disposed or not to receive his system, we may at least say this, that he has been honoured of God both to call attention to the subject, and to shed light both upon Daniel and the Apocalypse. With some things in the present work we can hardly concur ; but we feel assured that it will be read with interest by any who desire to compare passing events with the predictions of the Divine Word. Mr. Frere's dates are striking,—more so considerably than Fleming's, inasmuch as there is less of mere guessing, and more of solid scriptural reasoning contained in them. We do, however, mourn most deeply at the dishonour he does to the Word of God, by classing together the prophecies of Esdras and John, as he here does at page 41, and as he did in his earlier works. He thus strikes a deadly blow at inspiration,—for if he be entitled to claim Divine authority for the Apocryphal Book of Esdras, why may not Papists claim the same for the other books of the same rank ? It is sad to think that so venerated a student of the Word of God should err so grievously, and commit himself to an opinion which so much discredits Scripture, and dishonours that Spirit of truth by whom holy men of old spake. We close with an extract, in which we have a sketch of his views as to present events with their issues :—

"1st. The spread of the present revolution all over the Continent, to result in a new arrangement or consolidation of the former ten kingdoms of the Roman empire into three only, viz. the empire of Austria, the empire of Rome, and one other kingdom. And with respect to the first part of this anticipation, in what a wonderful manner have not my words been verified, since, in an advertisement inserted in the *Record* of Monday, 21st February, for the purpose of calling the attention of the public to the prophetical import of passing events, I undertook to designate the movements which had then already taken place in Switzerland, Sicily, and the Italian Peninsula, as '*the commencement of the universal Continental popular insurrection and revolution of the seventh apocalyptical vial of wrath*,' the extraordinary, and generally unlooked for, revolution in the kingdom of France not having then broken out.

"2dly. The final fall and overthrow of the Papacy or Babylon the Great.

"3dly. The appearance of the Infidel Antichrist upon the throne of Rome in his last manifestation, as the septimo-octave head and sovereign of the divided Roman empire, whose office it will be to finish the work, and complete the character as seen in its first manifestation in the person and work of the late Emperor Napoleon the Great.*

"4thly. The attack of Imperial Austria, aided by Russia, upon the Emperor of Rome.

"5thly. The repulse of Russia, and the fall of Austria by the sword of Rome.

"6thly. The expedition of the Emperor of Rome, at the head of all the forces

* "See 'Interpretation of Daniel's last Prophecy,'—'Combined View,' pp. 355 to 508 ; also 'Three Letters on the Prophecies,' viz. Letter X. 'On the Infidel Individual Antichrist,' pp. 10 to 29."

Digitized by Google

of the late Papal, now Infidel, Roman empire, into the Holy Land, and his conquest of Egypt.

"7thly. His return from Egypt into the Holy Land, and his destruction with all his hosts at the battle of Armageddon; together with the final and general restoration of all the tribes of Israel.

"And 8thly. The desolation of the late Papal, then Infidel, Roman empire by the armies or hordes of Russia.

"After which will follow a period of unexampled trouble, 'such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time,' of which the sufferings of the Jews at the destruction of Jerusalem, when their first dispensation was brought to a close, afford the only true and adequate type. During these troubles the old Roman empire will utterly perish and disappear as to its former political forms; and Great Britain also will be involved in them, and perish as a kingdom by popular revolution and insurrection. After all these great and awful events, a certain period will be occupied in the preparation of the earth for the glories of the millennial reign, to be effected by the preaching of the restored and converted Jews, which period is designated in the last chapter of the Prophet Zechariah as a day of progressive spiritual knowledge, or one, of which 'the light shall not be clear nor dark; but it shall be one day which shall be known to the Lord, not day nor night;' and then in reference to the Millennium, which is to succeed to it, it is added, 'But it shall come to pass that at evening time it shall be light; and it shall be in that day that living waters (the doctrines of salvation) shall go out from Jerusalem, and the Lord shall be king over all the earth; in that day there shall be one Lord and his name one:' for during that period of millennial glory and blessedness, the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea, and the whole world will be under a theocracy, of which Jerusalem and its re-edified temple will be the seat; typified, and we may believe only faintly typified, by the partial Jewish theocracy as it existed in the days of Solomon, and before their long captivity under the Gentiles began."

Daily Scripture Readings. By the late Thomas Chalmers, D.D., LL.D. Vol. III. Edinburgh. 1848.

Our object in introducing this interesting volume to the notice of our readers, is not for the purpose either of commending or discommending it at large; but solely with the view of extracting the references which it contains to the prophetical word. In a note received by the writer of this notice, from Dr. Chalmers, some time before his death, he says, "I am approximating much more closely to your prophetical views than I once did;" and in this volume we have the evidence of this approximation. We give the extracts simply, and without any remarks of our own. On the fiftieth Psalm, he writes thus:—

"This is a remarkable Psalm, and the subject of it seems to lie within the domain of unfulfilled prophecy,—there has been no appearance yet from Mount Zion at all corresponding with that made from Mount Sinai. And I am far more inclined to the literal interpretation of this Psalm, than to that which would restrict it to the mere preaching of the Gospel in the days of the apostles. It looks far more like the descent of the Son of man on the Mount of Olives, with all the accompaniments of a Jewish conversion and a first resurrection, and a destruction of the assembled hosts of Antichrist. The saints here summoned are those within the pale of the everlasting covenant, ratified with the blood of the sacrifice of Christ. The address here given is like that from the Son of God, now manifested to the Jews, who had returned, though yet unconverted, to the Holy Land; but who, now hearing the words, as well as seeing the person of Him whom they had pierced, are born in a day by the impressive remonstrance and overpowering spectacle."—P. 51.

Digitized by Google

On the sixty-eighth Psalm, he thus writes :—

"God has in reserve for his people still another restoration. He will bring them again, as of old, from Bashan and the Red Sea to their own land. His people will see him whom they have pierced; perhaps when His feet stand on the Mount of Olives, and Jerusalem will again become the metropolis of the Christian world."—P. 69.

On the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, he speaks thus :—

"He will appear for his own, the meek and poor in spirit, and will visit on its wickedness, that he may establish over it the reign of righteousness and truth. These will be days of love and universal peace, when the very animals shall cease to devour each other. It seems a most perplexing law, that of animals obviously framed for the destruction of each other; and may we not hope for the literal fulfilment of such a revolution as is set forth in these verses? This regeneration of the world is obviously conjoined with the restoration of the Jews."—P. 278.

On the twenty-fifth chapter of the same book, at the eighth verse, we have this query :—

"Can this be, that in the Millennium there will be no death? Surely, they who partake in the first resurrection, will not die over again."—P. 289.

On the seventh verse of the fifty-second chapter, he makes the following remark, which shows how decidedly his sympathies were with the literal interpreters of Scripture :—

"Their 'seeing eye to eye,' makes for the personal reign of Him whose feet shall stand on the Mount of Olives."—P. 326.

Since the above was written, we have received the first volume of his "Sabbath Scripture Readings," from which want of room prevents us extracting.

An Examination of the Statements made in the Thoughts on the Apocalypse, by B. W. Newton, and an Inquiry how far they accord with Scripture. By J. N. Darby. London.

In some things Mr. Darby is successful in his "Examination," but in several places we profess ourselves unable to follow him. He and Mr. Newton have got hold of some nice and intricate points, in reference to which it is not always easy to apprehend their reasonings, which are very subtle and far from scriptural simplicity. As a controversial work, Mr. Darby's is much too harsh and uncourteous for our taste. It has more of the rugged, and less of the gentle, than almost any prophetical volume that we have read. Were we to regard it as indicating the tone of feeling in that body to which he belongs, we should say that the meekness and gentleness of Christ are sorely lacking. We should not wish to be guilty of addressing a brother in the Lord, as Mr. Darby addresses Mr. Newton. Surely language like the following, is unseemly in a saint :—"It is very convenient to say this, but can any reasonable man be expected to receive things stated in this way?" (P. 83.) Again,—"This rests merely upon a decidedly bad and false translation of Greek." (P. 110.) Again,—"This is a complete mis-statement of the text." (P. 118.) Again,—"A system as regardless of geographical facts, as we have found it to be of Scrip-

Digitized by Google

ture statements, and grammar itself. I never met with a book like this in its assertions." (P. 200.) These are not a tithe of the unkind expressions scattered throughout the volume. Surely these things ought not so to be. It is sad, indeed, that a controversy upon Apocalyptic interpretation, between two Christian men, should call forth such unbrotherliness of language and tone. May we ourselves be kept from this!

The Crownless King of the Last Days and his Ten Vassal Kings. A Letter on the Prophecies of the Last Days, from the Rev. J. Fletcher to Rev. J. Wesley. With Introduction and Notes by W. G. RHIND. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1848.

JOHN FLETCHER was a Millenarian, and in this letter writes as such to John Wesley. The letter does not contain anything very remarkable or new, though it does contain some things from which we dissent. Mr. Rhind's preface is excellent; its closing paragraph, as containing words of solemn admonition to the Churches and to the saints, we cite:—

"No longer should the preaching of the Word be confined to churches, chapels, or rooms; but following the example of our Blessed Lord and of his apostles, of our illustrious fathers of the Reformation at St. Paul's Cross, of those revered servants of God, Whitefield, Wesley, Cennick, Howell Harris, Hill, and Charles of Bala, at the collieries, fairs, and places of assembly,—the highways should be traversed, the chief places of concourse should be sought, and the message,—the last message,—should be uttered as with an angel's voice, in the deep consciousness of impending judgments, 'Fear God and give glory to him;' even give glory to God by believing the Gospel—the unchanging, everlasting Gospel,—by believing in him whom the Father hath sent. Private Christians also, in their daily walk, should seize all opportunities to visit the sick, and distribute tracts, and talk by the wayside to their fellow-travellers to eternity. And not only with their lips, but in their lives, should the whole Church seek to testify the blessedness of being in Christ; and let none by a careless walk be a stumbling to others, for if the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness. And may that word of warning uttered by our Lord, when he left the temple for the last time, be before us 'UNTIL HE COME.'"

The Sixth Seal and the Seventh Vial. By J. G. Mansford. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1848.

THERE is much that is most seasonable in this Tract. It is vigorously written, and with much impartiality. Thus the author speaks of the state of England at the present moment:—

"But what of England? Here, too, alas! the *ranine* emissaries have been at work, and have given too evident proof of success of their mission. Popery, a long time nearly extinct, has been widely and rapidly reviving; and a *new* form of Popery, one of the special operations of the frogs, has gone far to unprotestantize the Established Church. If we take a survey of the different sections of the Church, we shall find new and strange combinations, all tending to a lowered standard both of faith and morals, either attracting a careless and fugitive attention on the part of those principally concerned, or none at all; or left to the vague expectation of their curing themselves, or disowned, or defended. Among the Dissenters, it is a generally-admitted fact, that the tone of spirituality amongst their Churches and congre-

Digitized by Google

gations has visibly declined. Of the existence, especially in certain localities, of this declension, there is, as perhaps might be expected, a greater agreement than in its causes. We shall not, however, I think, err greatly in including in the latter the depreciation of religious worship, properly so called—concentrating too much the idea of public worship in that of sermon-preaching : out of which arise—fastidiousness in hearing, an idolatry of talent, and a disproportionate and too often wasted labour imposed on the minister, who, to meet these demands, is too often compelled to bury himself in his study, and sink the pastor in the preacher. Thus the head is informed, and a morbid taste gratified, but the heart is not touched, and, as a necessary consequence, spiritual declension is inevitable. Other causes might be mentioned; some of which belong more especially to the working of the second of the three spirits. But there is one which requires to be separated from the rest for special notice. I allude to that altered and haughty tone of ultra-Independence,—urging its disciples into the thickest of ecclesiastical and political strife, prostituting the pulpit, the religious periodical, and the family newspaper, to its advocacy, and not sparing even Scripture itself,—which has made itself so conspicuous in certain quarters of late. The contentious, disputative, and unhumbled spirit thus engendered, is as utterly at variance with a spiritual and heavenward frame of mind—with the simplicity, meekness, and love, of the true Christian character, on the one side, as the loftiest aristocratical or hierarchical pride, or the rankest Tractarianism, on the other."

The First Resurrection and Rapture of the Saints. London.

Brief, but excellent. The latter part contains some pages that may be useful in the way of answering common errors and common objections.

The French Revolution of 1848, *viewed in the Light of Prophecy.* A Sermon by the Rev. R. S. Smith. Second Edition, with a few words on Chartism. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1848.

The sermon of a zealous servant of the Lord Jesus Christ and an ardent lover of his country. The words on Chartism are few but excellent.

The Theological and Literary Journal. Edited by D. N. Lord. No. I. July 1848. New York.

Though this Journal contains much valuable matter and able writing, yet we should like to see it assume a higher spiritual tone, and set itself more directly to the opening up of Scripture. It is pre-millennial in its views, and chiefly prophetical in its articles; so that even in America, the subject of the Lord's coming and kingdom is occupying the attention of Christians. We should like a little less controversy, and a total avoidance of Church and State allusions, which our American friends seem much too fond of thrusting in on all occasions.

Letters of the Rev. Samuel Rutherford. With Biographical Notices of his Correspondents, &c. Edinburgh. 1848.

We notice this work, not only on account of its being *by far the best and fullest edition of Rutherford's Letters ever published,* but for

Digitized by Google

the purpose of noticing the interesting fact, that Rutherford is continually referring to the second coming of the Lord. We do not know a book of that period, in which the allusions to this "Blessed hope" are so frequent, so pointed, and so beautiful.

Politics for the People. Parker. 1848.

WITHOUT expressing approval of all that this work contains, we may freely say, that it gives utterance to much solid and vigorous thought, —very suitable for the people and the times. We know that there is no real cure for the world's sore evils, but the coming of its King; yet let us do our utmost meanwhile to mitigate these evils, and stanch at least some of its wounds.

Notes on Scripture.

JOB XIV. 11—15.

THE reference of this passage to the resurrection is generally overlooked. Death and the grave are all that most expositors seem to see in it. But Job was a saint who had been taught the hope of rising again from the dead, and to whom that hope was precious in the midst of abounding sorrow. His belief was in a living Redeemer, and his eye rested not merely upon death, but upon life beyond it. The hope of the Church from the beginning has been one consummated in *resurrection.* Life out of death, both for soul and body, was what God had been making known. In believing God's record concerning the living Redeemer, we are put in possession of life that shall never die. But this is not all: we are at the same time put in possession of a hope,—a hope in which there is no uncertainty,—that this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal immortality. Hence our Lord so frequently closes his promise of life to the sinner that believeth, with these words, "And I will raise him up at the last day." (John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54.)

Of such a hope, it is evident that the Old Testament saints knew far more than we generally suppose. In that hope they rested and rejoiced. It is taken for granted throughout the whole of the Old Testament: and hence the New Testament never speaks of resurrection as a new doctrine—a doctrine hidden from the fathers and revealed by Christ,—but always treats it as a truth known and recognised of old. Hence it was that Martha, uttering the well-known hope of every Israelite, said, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." (John xi. 24.)

Let us mark how Job gave utterance to his hope in resurrection:—

"As the waters fail from the sea,
And the flood decayeth and drieth up,
So man lieth down, and riseth not
Till the heavens be no more:
They shall not awake, nor be raised up out of their sleep."

Digitized by Google

Here is the patriarch's hope of resurrection, and resurrection at the time when the heavens and earth are made new. When he falls asleep in Jesus, he beholds above him a troubled stormy firmament, and around him a groaning creation; when he awakes, he sees the former earth and the former heavens passed away, and all things renewed.

Then Job, keenly alive to his present misery, pleads for deliverance. He has learnt to look *beyond* the grave; but he has also learnt to look *into* it, and see in it the resting-place for a weary saint. He feels the storm beating heavily upon him, and he would fain be hidden from it. Like Paul, he has a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better. He knows that "blessed are the dead which die in the Lord." Thus he cries,—

"O that thou wouldst hide me in the grave,
That thou wouldst keep me secret,
Until thy wrath be past!
That thou wouldst appoint me a set time, and remember me!"

He asks to be hidden, but only for a while; he asks to be kept secret, but not "out of mind;" he is glad to seek refuge in the grave, but he pleads for a time to be set, in which he will be remembered and brought up.

Then he asks,—

"If a man die, shall he live?"

And the answer evidently is, Yes, he shall live! He shall come up from that grave to which he had gone down; and because he knows this, and is assured of it, he thus gives calm utterance to his trust:—

"All the days of my appointed time will I wait,
Till my *change* come."

His flesh rests "in hope." He goes to the grave to wait for his change—a change from corruption to incorruption: when Christ shall change our vile body, that he may make it like unto his own glorious body.

When that appointed time is expired, he shall be remembered. He felt as if God had said to him, what he did afterwards to Daniel, "Go thou thy way till the end be; for thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." (Dan. xii. 13.) So the patriarch assures himself, that ere long he shall hear the voice of a faithful God calling him from the tomb, "the voice of the archangel and the trump of God." And when that voice is heard, "Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust," then he will respond, and leap up,—

"Thou shalt call,
And I will answer!"

For he is persuaded of the faithful love of his God. He knows that to this God his very dust is precious:—

"Thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands."

Thus Job "rejoiced in hope." *His* hope was a blessed one, as well

Digitized by Google

as ours. It might not be as bright and ample, but it was as sure; it was the same hope, though only budding. And thus we are one with the saints of other days—one with them not only in mortality and suffering, but one with them in the hope of immortality and blessedness. Our joy is one, and our heritage is one. They have had to wait for it somewhat longer than we, but it is the same promise on which we rest, and the same glory on which we shall enter. And the time is at hand!

Proverbs xxi. 16.

"The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead."

There is no difference of opinion among critics as to the *translation* of these words. In substance they all agree with each other and with our received version. Nor, in this respect have we any alteration to propose. But as to the *meaning* they affix to the words we demur. They concur in interpreting them, or at least the latter part of them, "shall remain among the dead in trespasses and in sins." Thus the elder Michaelis renders them "*qui in peccatis suis mortui sunt.*"—(Annot. vol. i. p. 1323.)

It appears to us that these words of Solomon, "shall remain in the congregation of the dead," are exactly parallel to those of Isaiah. (xxvi. 14.)—"They are deceased, they shall not rise;" and to those of John "the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished;" in other words, that they mean "shall not be partakers of the first resurrection." This view is greatly strengthened by the fact that the word used in Isaiah (רְפָאִים, deceased) is the same with that used here (dead). And in the prophet, the reference is manifestly to the ungodly who are not to share the blessedness of the resurrection from the dead; for almost immediately after, the contrast is presented to us, "thy dead shall live; my dead body shall they arise." And as it is here said that they who "wander out of the way of understanding" shall not share in the "resurrection unto life," so on the other hand it is said, "the WISE shall inherit GLORY," and elsewhere "they that be WISE shall shine as the brightness of the firmament."—Whereas, of the man that followeth the "foolish woman" it is said, "he knoweth not that the dead (רְפָאִים) are there."—(ix. 18.) Again of the "strange woman" it is said, "her house inclineth unto death, and her paths unto the *dead.*" (Same Hebrew word, ii. 18.) And then, in verses 21 and 22, we are told of the upright inheriting the earth, while the wicked are cut off from it and transgressors rooted out of it.

More references to the resurrection, the glory, and the kingdom, might perhaps be found in the Book of Proverbs, which has generally been supposed to contain none such. These however are given as specimens, shewing that Solomon, no less than David, had his eye fixed upon the "blessed hope," and was looking forward to the fulfil-

Digitized by Google

ment of God's purposes in resurrection newness and resurrection beauty.

Examination of our Lord's Argument in John x. 30-40.

"Never man spake as this man." (John vii. 46.) The believer will readily admit the truth of this testimony of the officers sent by the Pharisees to arrest Jesus. Yet the sentiment, as extorted from a Jew, had a different bearing from the assent which is yielded by a Christian. With the one it was a conviction forced upon the understanding against the inclination, whereas with the other, it accords with the feeling, even where in some instances it is difficult for the intellect to trace the strict connexion of the argument.

John x. 30, &c., may be cited as an instance. The Jews, not willing to honour the Son, saw clearly that the language of Jesus went to prove his Divine Majesty, while Gentile commentators who believe in his Deity, do not find it easy to perceive the irresistible nature of his argument. If we discover the cause of this difficulty in our apprehension, we shall get the right clue for the interpretation of the passage.

There clearly is no defect in the argument, for in that case the Jews would not have been convinced; their malignity might have dulled their apprehension of the excellent, but would not have blunted their acuteness in discerning error. But do we sufficiently bear in mind that the argument was addressed to Jews? We may fancy that our Lord attempted to prove points which they would have admitted, but which have since been subjects of dispute amongst Christians, and on the other hand, we may lose sight of the necessity of proving certain doctrines at which the scribes would have cavilled, but which are not litigated subjects at present. I will endeavour to trace the argument as it would have been presented to the mind of a Jew.

In John x. 30, our Lord declares his *oneness* with the Father. This assertion must be taken in connexion with the circumstance recorded in the eighth chapter, to which St. John distinctly refers, as by saying, "Then the Jews took up stones *again* to stone him." (Compare John x. 31, with viii. 58, 59.) The Jews before took up stones to stone him, because he assumed the title of I AM, and the Evangelist, in the present narrative recording the equal indignation with which the Jews received this announcement, leads us to infer that our blessed Lord, on the present occasion, assumed a title of equivalent dignity; one in short, which in their estimation amounted to blasphemy.

"My Father" is a term of relation, which necessarily implies a sonship; in saying that God was his Father, Jesus made himself Son of God. But saying that he was a Son of God, would be no blasphemy in the estimation of the Jews,—they in fact claimed such a relationship themselves. (John viii. 41.) The supposed blasphemy consisted in the character of the Sonship which was claimed; it was a Sonship involving unity, "I and my Father *are* One." He affirmed that he was so Son to the Father, that he was one with him in the unity of the

Digitized by Google

Divine Essence, for the *oneness* subsisting between Father and Son, is not a unity of person, or of ordination, but of nature.

From our Lord's language, the Jews therefore inferred, legitimately and properly, that he claimed the essential Sonship,—this their reception of the announcement demonstrates; "We stone thee," say they, "for blasphemy," thou "makest thyself God." If such then was his assumption, we cannot imagine that Messiah retracts his former position respecting his essential unity with the Father, and defends a claim to some lower dignity; his proof must be equal to his assertion.

But these are two very different points, and which in the mind of a Jew would be perfectly distinct, but which Christians are not so much in the habit of discriminating, not because the ideas are similar, but because those who admit the one, are equally prepared to concede the other, and those who deny the one, do in like manner reject the other. The plurality of persons in the Godhead is the one dogma to which I refer, the hypostatical union, or the assumption of the manhood into God, is the other.

The Christian Church has been so vexed with the Socinian controversy, as unconsciously to assume that the Jews denied a plurality of persons in the Godhead. But, though some may have disputed it, I much doubt whether, in our Lord's time, they would have affixed a charge of blasphemy upon those who held that doctrine. Agar asks respecting the Creator, "What is his name, and what is his son's name?" (Prov. xxx. 4), and the works of the rabbins are full of acknowledgments of the Trinity. Upon this occasion, certainly, the accusation was not simply, "Thou makest thyself God," but "Thou *being a man*, makest thyself God." It is not the assertion that there is such a relation in the Godhead as Father and Son, but that he who is man, should claim to be one with the Father in the unity of the Divine Essence. The taking of the manhood into God they did consider to be blasphemy, "We stone thee . . . . for blasphemy, and because that thou being a man makest thyself God."

This charge made it incumbent upon our Lord, before he proved his unity with the Father in the indivisible Essence, to show the dignity derived to his human nature by the hypostatical union; to establish in short, that humanity in his person has a right to the title of "Son of God." The whole of the argument, therefore, consists of two distinct parts, and it is the first only, I apprehend, which is proved from the quotation out of the eighty-second Psalm.

"Is it not written in your law, 'I said ye are gods?'" I must here pause for one moment to consider who are styled gods. What is the nature, and why the cause of this honorary designation? Not all governors, but the rulers of God's people are styled Elohim, or Gods. Besides the passage cited by our Lord, Exodus xxi. 6, and xxii. 9, 28, are very distinct examples. The rulers are styled Elohim, I conceive, as representatives of the Elohim who is to "inherit all nations," and who will arise "and judge the earth," for so the opposition in the Psalm seems to carry it: they judge unjustly; they do not defend

Digitized by Google

the poor, &c., therefore is the apostrophe to him to come and perform that which they, as his representatives, ought to have done. It follows that the dignity involved in this title, as far as it refers to the judges, is *derived* and *representative*.

I now return to our Lord's argument. He prepares to apply the quotation in the following words:—"If he called them Gods unto whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken." And here, I apprehend, that each part of the assumption from the quotation of the Psalm, has its counterpart in this sentence, which is preparatory to applying the proof, and which I should parallel as follows:—

"It is written in your law," to which corresponds, "The Scripture cannot be broken;" then, "I said, ye are Gods," answerable to which is, "If he called them Gods," or, "If those be called Gods." But there is still one clause in the application of our Lord which wants its mate, it is, "unto whom the Word of God came." This, I apprehend we shall discover, when we decide who it is in the Psalm that said, "Ye are gods," and who or what the Word is, which came to the rulers.

In Psalm lxxxii., God, or Elohim, mentioned in verse 1, who judgeth among the Gods or Elohim, appears to be the speaker in verse 6, who said "Ye are gods," and we may perceive a personal distinction between him and "The Most High," in the same sense; and it was common with the rabbins, in those passages of Scripture, where two Persons in the Deity appear to be mentioned, for them to interpret one of "THE WORD."*

And there are passages in the Old Testament which seem to justify this mode of interpretation. In 1 Kings xviii. 31, there is, for example, an expression quite similar to that used by our Lord . . . . . . "the tribes of the sons of Jacob unto whom *the Word of Jehovah came*, saying, 'Israel shall be thy name.'" This refers to the transaction, Gen. xxxii. 24-28. A man (ver. 24) who was the Elohim (ver. 28, 30), and El (ver. 30), and an Angel (Hos. xii. 4), that is, not in nature, but in office, "He said, 'Thy name shall be called no more Jacob but Israel.'" (Gen. xxxii. 28.) Hence, He who appeared as man, and who was Elohim, and an Angel, or one sent, was also "The Word of Jehovah" who "came" to Jacob.

We have learned then that "The Word of God" was a title not strange to the rabbins, but on the contrary, quite in accordance with their mode of interpreting Scripture; and that in giving that title to the Messiah, they did not fall into error, but were supported by the Old Testament. Then, if St. John in the very introduction to his history, intimates that "The Word" is the subject of his discourse, it appears not improbable that some of the arguments in this Gospel should more or less depend upon the claim of Jesus to that title.

Would it not be in accordance with his wisdom to make use of

* Lightfoot on John, vol. xii. p. 229—230, and Jackson, book vii. chap. 27, give several instances; one example will be sufficient:—In Hos. i. 7, Jehovah saves by Jehovah,—Jonathan says it is by The Word.

Digitized by Google

that which the Scribes truly believed, in order to convince them of that which they erroneously denied? And it appears to me that the passage in question is one in which "The Word of God" is a personal designation, for the act of coming is a personal act, and the structure of the passage confirms it, for thus the Word of God who came to the Elohim is he who "said, 'ye are Gods;'" and so each part of the quotation has its counterpart in the sentence in which our Lord prepares to apply it, and all is duly balanced.

But suppose, on the other hand, that we understand the Word to be the written Word, in that case it would be synonymous with "the Scripture" or "the Law," in which it is said, rulers are Elohim; but it seems somewhat strange to say that the word came to the rulers because in the law they are styled Elohim, there seems to be no correspondence between the two clauses, for "Is it not written in your law?" has no counterpart in "Unto whom the Word of God came."

Moreover, were we to admit that the coming of the Word to the rulers meant that they derived authority from the written Word to be styled Elohim, then, I own, I see not how the passage supports our Lord's claim even to the derived dignity of Elohim. He would be taking for granted the very question which the Jews disputed; they did not admit his call, "This man is not of God" "We know that God spake unto Moses: [as for] this [fellow] we know not whence he is," (John ix. 16, and 29.) was their unhesitating language concerning him. But if the personal Word is intended, the whole of the proof (except the question of identity, which our Lord subsequently establishes) is derived from the quotation, as I will proceed to show.

"If ye call them Gods unto whom the Word of God *came*, . . . say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and *sent*," &c. Here "came" and "sent" appear to be correlative, the Word who came is he whom the Father sent; thus our Lord's words, "He whom the Father sanctified and sent," are not introduced without support from the quotation out of the Old Testament.

But now the question arises, does Jesus, by this argument, directly establish his absolute deity as the fountain head from whence the derived dignity of the rulers or Elohim flowed? or does he urge the derived right of the human nature in his person to be styled Son of God, and only in the following verses make good his claim to being one with the Father? The former is the view, I believe, generally taken by the orthodox: St. Augustine, for example, says, "If the Word of God came to men that they might be called gods, wherefore is not the same Word of God, *God* which is with God? . . . . If lights illuminated be gods, is not that light which doth illuminate them God? (*Augustine on John, Tract* 48, *in Christ's confession and complaint.*) I, however, rather prefer the other view, * because the Sonship which

* In this I am not altogether alone, for Dr. Goodwin observes on this text (*Christ the Mediator*, chap. vi. p. 17), "The assumption of our nature into one person with the Son of God, was a thing, though credible when revealed, because possible, yet hardly so conceived. It was the great stumbling-block of he Jews." He then quotes these words as his proof.

Digitized by Google

our Lord intends to establish, appears to have relation to his sanctification and mission into the world. "Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, 'thou blasphemest,' because I said I am the Son of God?" Now the manner in which our Lord was "sent into the world," was by his incarnation; "God sent forth his Son made of a woman." (Gal. iv. 4.) "When he cometh into the world, he saith, 'a body hast thou prepared me. . . . Then said I, "Lo I come.'" (Heb. x. 5, 7.) But this is not the essential Sonship, it is the Sonship derived to the human nature by personal union with the WORD. Again, it must be noted, that our Lord, though charged with making himself God, does not in this part of the argument either affirm or deny it, but says, that he is the Son of God. Nor do the Jews at this point of the argument attempt to stone him, they had before resented his language as blasphemous, and they did afterwards. But here they heard him with patience, though he affirmed an existence prior to his incarnation, and implied his having been set apart to an office together with his assumption of humanity, in order to the discharge of his official relations. This part of his argument he proves in the following verse. I now proceed to state what appears to be the proof derived from the eighty-second psalm.

Human nature in the persons of these rulers, according to the written Word of God, "which cannot be broken," had a derived right to the title of Elohim, in consequence of their being representatives of the Elohim who "will inherit all nations," to whom they will have to give an account when he shall arise "and judge the earth;" to whom, therefore, they are greatly inferior. But if human nature in the persons of these rulers had, by official designation, this derived right to the title of Elohim,* surely that holy thing † born of the Virgin—the humanity of our Lord, which had no personality of itself, but derived its personality from the WORD, ‡ had an undoubted right to be stiled "Son of God." The Word does not lose his essential glory because he has assumed humanity into personal union, but the humanity is exalted into the personal relation of Son to God, so that he being a man, is yet justified in making or stiling himself Son of God.

Our Lord, in the next place, again reverts to the support derived from his miracles; but the evidence which he deduces from his works is twofold. "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not." Here he appeals to the many good works which he had shown them from the Father, as establishing the veracity of his words, they sanctioned his mission, and therefore confirmed the truth of what he told them in the thirty-sixth verse; that he is that WORD whom the Father had

* "If men by partaking of the Word come to be stiled Gods, much more the Word of which they are so called by participation is God."—(*Augustine in Meyer.*)

† "The expression is emphatical, 'even also that holy thing which is born of thee, even that shall be called the Son of God.'"—(*Owen*, vol. viii. *p.* 270.)

‡ "The Son of God communicates his personality, his subsistence to the man Christ Jesus." (*Goodwin, of Christ the Mediator, p.* 51.)

sanctified and sent into the world, and who thus had exalted humanity in his person to the relation of Son to God.

Then in the thirty-eighth verse, Jesus urges his miracles as demonstrative of that power to which he had laid claim in the thirtieth verse, that power which he had in common with the Father, and which betokened their essential unity; for if one in power, then one in essence: for God's attributes can no more be separated from his essence than can his existence. In this thirty-eighth verse, therefore, is the transition from the one to the other part of his argument; the works inferentially confirmed the truth of what Jesus said, but they directly proclaim the power of the Divine Majesty, "Believe the works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him," which is tantamount to his former assertion, "I and my Father are one." * So that our Lord again virtually asserts that for which the Jews before charged him with blasphemy, and their mode of receiving the statement shews that they so understood him, "Therefore they sought again to take him: but he escaped out of their hand."

JOHN XII. 31, 32.

The courts of the temple were full of passover-worshippers. Priest and Scribe, Pharisee and Sadducee, Elder and Herodian, all might have been seen worshipping together, as reference was made to the triumphant entrance of Jesus, which had taken place amid such enthusiasm on the part of the people, and so suddenly, that he had cleansed the temple of the buyers and sellers ere ever they had time to question his authority. And now, the setting sun was slanting his rays over the city, and the evening-sacrifice was on the altar. But there prevailed a most unusual stillness over the place, and every countenance exhibited feelings of awe.

There had been a voice from the Holiest of All! The voice of the Lord had been heard! The awful voice of Jehovah had spoken that day! It was not, however, from the temple "made with hands;" not from within its veil; not from above its typical mercy-seat. The voice had come down from *heaven* itself, from within the curtain of the sky, and had been heard speaking of *Jesus*—the true mercy-seat. Some who heard it said, "An angel spake to him!"—the voice was so heavenly; others said, "It *thundered*"—the voice was so majestic: but all were overawed, and silently listened to Jesus himself,

* "The persons of the Godhead by reason of the unity of their substance do as necessarily remain one within another as they are of necessity to be distinguished one from another, ... and since they all are but one God in number, one indivisible essence or substance, their distinction cannot possibly admit separation. For how should that subsist solitarily by itself which hath no substance, but individually the very same whereby others subsist with it?" (*Hooker*, *p.* 199.) "The Jews would perceive that Jesus claimed to be that angel in whom was the name of Jehovah, Ex. xxiii. 21. Aben Ezra says this angel is Michael; Jarchi remarks that the rabbins say this is *Metatron*, and Philo says it is The Word." (*Gill on* Ex. xxiii. 21.) All probably, certainly the two last, intimating a Divine person.

Digitized by Google

when he declared it to be the voice of the Father comforting him for our sakes.

It was immediately after this that Jesus explained the whole scene; —and in noticing his words we must bear in mind the circumstances in which he spoke. He had recently appeared in two aspects, one of which seemed quite irreconcileable with the other. He had come in as *a king*, amid hosannas and the waving of palm-branches by the multitude of Jerusalem; and yet shortly after he had stood in that temple as *A Man of sorrows*. At one time he had so appeared that all might say to Zion, "*Thy king cometh!*" (ver. 15,) and yet, soon after had been so troubled and amazed in spirit as to cry out, "Shall I say, *Father, save me from this hour?*" (Ver. 27.)

Now, it was in these peculiar circumstances that the Father's voice had been uttered, telling him that he had "*Glorified his name*" already, and "*would glorify it again.*" Did not the declaration of the Father imply that he was completely satisfied with all that his beloved Son had done? And did it not refer also to a time when he would get glory to his name from him in another way? Did it not speak to this effect; "I have got glory to my name by all thy work of obedience and suffering; and the time is coming when I shall get glory to my name from thee in thy exaltation?"

Our Lord was strengthened in his human nature by this voice, and immediately called the attention of all to himself and his work. There were two things which he sought to impress upon them, viz., the results of his suffering in dethroning Satan, and the effect of his work in ultimately bringing all the earth to himself. In verse 31 he proclaimed Satan's cause ruined and lost; "*Now is the prince of this world cast out.*" Why "*Now?*" Because Christ by his suffering unto death, "destroyed him that had the power of death." And how is this connected with "*Now is the judgment of this world?*" Because by this he means, that his suffering unto death had gained a sentence from the Judge in our world's favour. The Judge, satisfied with the work of our Surety, had declared that Satan's right over our world was at end; the *Seed of the Woman* had now "*bruised the head of the serpent.*" *

Having thus declared, in the audience of Priests and Scribes, Pharisees and Sadducees, Herodians and Elders, that he was the long-promised "*Seed of the Woman,*" he now declares farther, that he is the "*Shiloh*" to whom the gathering of the peoples should be. For verse 32 is to this effect, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, shall draw all men to me." The "*If*" here is expressive of no more doubt than it is in the original of 1 John iii. 2. The lifting up of the Son of man on the cross was no more a matter of doubt than is his exaltation to the throne. The force of the words is this; "And I, as certainly as you shall see my lifting up on the

* For this sense of "judgment," see Psalm xxxvii. 6, xciv. 15; Isa. xlii. 1, 3, &c.

cross, shall yet draw all men to me." If the one take place, so shall the other, beyond all doubt; now, by this language he proclaims, that *his being lifted up on the cross* shall be followed at another time by *his drawing all men to him.* His humiliation shall be followed by his exaltation. His death shall itself become the very magnet that is to attract men to him. The scene of his *cross* shall be followed up by his gathering in subjects to his *crown.*

We admit that he speaks of the effect of his dying in such a way as to imply, that *all who are ever drawn to him shall be drawn by means of his cross.* Still, this is not the whole meaning. It does not exhaust the subject on hand. We are led to expect something parallel to *Satan being cast out of this world.* We are led to listen to something expressive of *this world actually delivered,* not merely of *deliverance provided for this world,* or for whomsoever of this world might embrace it.

Is it not, then, evident that our Lord meant to proclaim, that there should yet be a time when the *world would be his possession as much as it had ever been Satan's?* He declared that the grand result of his death should be, not merely the deliverance of his few disciples under a dispensation of trial and sorrow, but should result at last in his appearing as the *Great Shiloh,* the world's magnet. Though he does not specify time or means, is it not plain that he is referring to the *latter days,* when he says, "I shall draw all men to me?" His eye rested in hope upon the glories of his future kingdom, when, instead of being attended by a few disciples, all Israel should cry, "Blessed is he that cometh!"—and so "all Israel be saved." His eye beheld the day when "they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord; and *all the nations* shall be gathered unto it" (Jer. iv. 17)—when "men shall be blessed in him, *all nations* shall call him blessed." (Ps. lxxii. 17.) "Yea, all kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him." (Ver. 11.)

Often do we find our Lord thus looking from Calvary to the Mount of Olives—from his humiliation to his final exaltation. Even at the time when he instituted the supper to "show his death," how often did he intersperse the mention of his "kingdom." And in the Psalms, how frequently does "the sower, who went forth weeping," think upon his "return, bringing his sheaves with him." It is altogether characteristic of him whose human soul sought refreshment from its sorrows in the prospects of the future—"who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross."

Oh! with such a day in view, with such glories before us, how dark and dismal is the portion of a soul that slights this Saviour! It was Jesus—this same Jesus—who, after this, added a warning to such as are not within the warmth of his rays:—"While ye have light, believe in the light." (Ver. 36.) "Yet a little while is the light with you." (Ver. 35.) Perhaps the sun was just setting as he spoke these words; at all events, no sooner were they spoken, than he, the Sun of Righteousness, "departed, and did hide himself from them." Who can tell

Digitized by Google

how near, in our day also, the warning may be to the final departure? And who can imagine the exquisite agony of a soul that shall see some rays of the glory of *the crown*, when *the cross* is for ever hid from his eyes! He is lost—he is shut out for ever—he is swept away in wrath, carrying with him the conviction, that if he had only seen and believed the cross, he would have shared in the crown!

---

1 Cor. xv. 24—28.

Does Christ ever cease to be Mediator? No. He remains Mediator for ever; as the old Puritan Divine, William Ames, says—"*Christus etiam post diem judicii manebit Rex et Mediator in eternum.*" *

By Mediatorship we understand the medium of communication between God and man. In Christ Jesus, the Word made flesh, the God-man, the Divine High Priest, this is secured and placed upon a footing which nothing can overthrow. In Him God has provided an eternal meeting-place between himself and the sinner. He is the everlasting link between the Creator and creature, and through Him communion is to be carried on throughout eternity. His first act as Mediator is our reconciliation; and this act may be said to be *repeated* day by day with us. But after the *reconciling* act of Mediatorship is at an end, when we are glorified, still the *communicating* (if one may so speak) must go on for ever. The Mediatorial character he must retain eternally, else one great end of his assumption of flesh is nullified.

But it is not said that he is to "deliver up" the kingdom. He is certainly said παραδιδοναι τὴν βασιλείαν,—*tradere* regnum,—but what does this mean? We would say with *Ames, non sic tradet regnum Patri, ut ipsemet cesset regnare: sed ut Patri repræsentet regnum suum completum, quale mansurum est in æternum.*

It can easily be shewn that παραδιδωμι does not necessarily mean, to resign or abdicate. It frequently occurs in the signification of simply *presenting*, or setting before another, for his consideration or approbation, without at all implying resignation. In this very chapter (verse 3) we read, "*I delivered* unto you first of all, that which ye also received, that Christ died for our sins;" where παρέδωκα, does not mean the parting with or resigning the doctrine, but the presenting of it. In the eleventh chapter also of this Epistle (verse 2), we have both the verb and the noun, καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε; in which passage there can be nothing of resignation implied, but merely presentation. In like terms we read of "the holy commandments *delivered* unto them," and of "the faith once *delivered* unto the saints." Theodoret as quoted by Suicer,† says expressly, παραδιδωσι τὴν βασιλειαν, ὀυκ ἀυτος τῆς βασιλειας γυμνοῦμενος, κ.τ.λ., "He delivers up the kingdom, not by being divested of the kingdom, but by bringing the devil and his auxiliaries

* Amesii Medulla Theologica, lib. i. c. xli. § 34.
† Thes. Eccles., tom. i. p. 668.

Digitized by Google

into subjection." And one of our Reformation commentators thus expounds it,—"*cum Patri tradiderit (regnum) id est obtulerit seu præsentârit ut victoriæ suæ trophæum, ut in iis plenâ gloriâ æternum regnet ac triumphet.*"

The delivering up the kingdom is not, then, the abdication of it, but the presentation, or exhibition of it to the Father as a work consummated. It is to something of this kind that there is an allusion in Jude 24, (though *that* refers to a scene at the commencement, not the close of the millennium, as our present passage does,) "to present you faultless before the presence of his glory."

But the twenty-eighth verse seems to imply a real and total abdication of authority, "then shall the Son also himself be subject to him that put all things under him." If this, however, be interpreted in the way in which it is usually, then it teaches us that Christ's first coming was an exaltation, not a humiliation,—a receiving of new dignity and glory, not a laying them aside; and that his second coming will be a humiliation, not an exaltation; a resignation of glory and authority, not an investment with them. What passage of Scripture is there that leads us to look for a humiliation, a taking off the crown, a resignation of authority, a stepping down from off the throne, so as to be upon a lower level than what he has hitherto occupied? Can the usual interpretation, then, be received.

Now let us consider that from the time he came to do the Father's will he had been subject to the Father, as *the Christ*, for it is written "the head of Christ is God;" and he himself testified, "my father is greater than I." As the Christ, the Godman, he was, he is, and shall ever be subject to the Father, though as God, as the Word, as the Son, he is the equal of the Father. Whatever be the glory received by him from having finished the work which was given him to do, yet no circumstances of glory can ever raise him *as Redeemer* to an equality with the Father. Even after his success has been consummated,—after he has redeemed those whom the Father hath given him:—after he has brought the whole world into subjection, triumphing over all his enemies, even then he will still be "subject to the Father." This is the object of the apostle's statement in the 28th verse. For the true rendering is, "when all things shall be subdued unto him (the Son), *even then* or *then* also (τοτε και) shall the Son be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." And we may notice that there is a change in the words; it is not said that *the Father* (as before) but that *God* or the Godhead may be all in all. As if to say that if the Son were not continuing subject to the Father as hitherto, then God would not be all in all. Thus when his triumphs are all completed; when his glory as Redeemer is at its height, and he can look down from his throne upon "all things made new," even then his subjection to the Father is exhibited as heretofore, that all the universe may know the difference between his glory as the Christ and his glory as the eternal Word,—between the divine and the human, between the created and uncreated;—that God may be all in all, for

Digitized by Google

of him and through him, and to him are all things ; to whom be glory for ever. Amen.

Hebrews II. 15.

"And deliver those who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject unto bondage."

This verse is generally supposed to teach, that saints under the former dispensation had no "full assurance of faith;" *that* they laboured under perpetual doubts as to their standing before God, and that death was on this account to them a matter of continual terror. But does it teach this? were the saints before the Lord's coming not assured? Was theirs of necessity a doubting state? Surely not. The whole breadth of Jehovah's character had not yet been opened up ; but enough had been seen to rest upon without a fear. The whole riches of grace had not yet been spread out ; but enough had been made known to rebuke all doubt and to assure them of acceptance. That which they believed, though it was not all that we now believe, was sufficient to give them perfect peace and to give them entire confidence towards God. In the sense of *doubting* they were not necessarily "in bondage." It was their privilege to rejoice in God, just as it is ours. It was their sin to have less than peace, or less than assurance, just as it is ours. In looking to the sin-bearer, their bonds were loosed, their souls relieved, their consciences pacified and laid to rest. Their joy might be less large or triumphant than ours ; for they knew less of Jehovah's precious character, and it is upon this that the fulness of our peace depends ; but still they had *peace;* their bonds were broken.

The apostle is evidently referring to their fear of *death.* Throughout the New Testament we find many examples of this fear. Not that they feared to meet God face to face, or were uncertain as to whether or not condemnation might be awaiting them. But *death* itself was dreaded as an evil and an enemy. It was a thing of gloom and grief. Resurrection had not yet shone out so brightly, as to take from death all that made it terrible. They knew resurrection, indeed, but not so fully as we do ; for though it was known from the beginning, yet its brightness was reserved for the coming of Christ in flesh to manifest. When he came, or at least after he was raised, resurrection shone out in all its blessedness and glory. Then, all darkness disappeared from the tomb. The sense of bondage, which the prospects of going down to the grave engendered, was removed. They could sing the glad song, "O death, where is *now* thy sting! O grave, where is *now* thy victory!" Up till the resurrection of the Lord, there had been always a sting in death, and an apparent victory in the grave, which kept them in bondage. *Now,* all that was over; for *He* had come, who by death was to destroy him that had the power of death, and to deliver them who through fear of death had been all their lifetime subject to bondage. *He* had shown himself as the resurrection and the life,—giving promise of glad resurrection to his saints. *He* had made known "the

Digitized by Google

first resurrection,"—the "resurrection unto life,"—the "resurrection out from among the dead,"—hitherto but dimly seen.

Heb. XI. 39, 40.

The apostle has completed his enumeration of the long line of worthies who were well spoken of on account of their faith. It was their faith that marked them out before man and God. Much good could not be affirmed of them in many respects,—but this could be said, "they believed." They were formed out of no better clay than others. They possessed natures not less defiled. But still "they believed." It was their believing that brought them nigh to God at first: it was their believing that kept them continually nigh. It was simply as believers that God recognised them; and it was simply as believers that they walked with God. Theirs was a believing life from first to last. And such is the life of every saint. Such is to be the Church's life until the Lord come. She has everything in promise, nothing in possession. She has a kingdom in reversion, but not an inch of ground in actual enjoyment now. Nor is one age or section of the Church better than another in this respect: all are the same; all have the same hope,—but not one have received the inheritance. That inheritance is equally a *future* thing to all; all are to receive it together; not one before the other. This is, in substance, the apostle's statement in the passage before us, which has been so often discussed, but little understood:—

"All these (ancient believers), though they received a good report on account of their faith, yet were not put in possession of the thing promised." They neither received the inheritance at the time they were here, nor have they received it since. It is still one of the "good things to come."

Then follows a clause which ought either to be read as a parenthesis, or placed at the end of the verse. Let us treat it as a parenthesis, and omit it until we have connected the last clause of the verse with the 39th. The whole would run thus:—"These all, though they received a good report on account of their faith, yet did not receive the thing promised, in order that they, without us, should not be perfected." That is to say, the actual possession of the inheritance (or thing promised) has not been given; it has been deferred (till the Lord come), in order that no age or section of the Church should be perfectly blest and glorified without all the rest; for all must be raised together; all must be caught up together; all must be crowned together.

What, then, is the meaning of the parenthesis? Its meaning is as follows:—The apostle had spoken of *the promise*, or thing promised; and having mentioned this, he adds parenthetically, by way of explanation, "For God has indeed some better thing in view for us, no less than for them." That is to say, "The inheritance is for *us*, as well as for *them;* the promise was indeed made to them, but it includes *us*

Digitized by Google

also." The "better thing" is not to be taken as meaning some better thing for *us* than what *they* possessed. No. But as referring to something better than any had yet received; something which eye had not seen, nor ear heard; something more glorious than had ever been enjoyed by any saint, or any portion of the Church, from the beginning.

That "better thing" is the inheritance—the kingdom. This inheritance belongs to us who live in these latter days, no less than to those in earlier times. It is an inheritance which God himself has prepared. It is an inheritance which becomes ours, in title and right, the moment that we believe,—but which shall be enjoyed by none until the Lord come.

Hence it is to the day of the Lord that we look as to the day of our common re-entrance into Eden—the day when, as one vast multitude out of every nation, we shall together enter in through the gates into the city—the day of our common crowning, our common triumph; for it is to be *one* crowning, *one* triumph, *one* entrance for the whole Church from the beginning: they are not crowned alone, or in fragments, or in sections,—but in one glorious hour they receive their everlasting crowns, and take their seats in simultaneous gladness upon the long-expected throne.

Extracts.

Israels Redemption or the Propheticall History of our Saviours Kingdome on Earth, that is, of the Church Catholicke, and Triumphant. With a Discourse of Gog and Magog, or the Battle of the Great Day of God Almightie. By Robert Maton, Minister and Mr. of Arts, and sometimes Commoner of Wadham Colledge in Oxford. 1642.

"And so I passe from the thing to be restored, which is the Kingdome of *Israel:* to the Person by whom it is to be restored, which is Christ the Lord, at his next appearing. *For they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore againe the Kingdome to Israel?*

"That our Mediatour hath undergone the offices of a Priest and Prophet, the Gospel is our witnesse: but considering that the Jewes are yet to receive a Kingdome; a Kingdome in which they *shall hold them captives, whose captives they are;* and in which peace and righteousnesse shall flourish on the earth: considering this I say, we may justly doubt, whether our Saviour hath as yet executed the office of a King: and so much the rather, because he tooke our nature on him, as well to performe his kingly office therein amongst us, as either his priestly or propheticall; the glory of this being indeed the reward of that contempt and torment which he suffered in the others: and

Digitized by Google

though it cannot be denied, that *he hath already* spoyled principalities and powers* (that is, the evill spirits) *and hath made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in his crosse :* nor that *he is* † *ascended up on high, and hath led captivity captive, and given gifts unto men :* nor that *he is become the* ‡ *Head of all principality and power* (that is, of the Saints and holy Angels) and *is set* § *downe at the right hand of the Throne of God :* so that *he is* || *able even to subdue all things unto himselfe :* Yet that he doth not now reigne in that Kingdome which he shall governe as man, and consequently, in that of which the Prophets speake, his owne words in the third of the *Revel.* at the 21. *vers.* doe clearely prove. *To him that overcometh,* saith he, *will I grant to sit with me in my Throne ; even as I also overcame, and am set downe with my Father in his Throne :* from whence it followes, that the Throne which here he cals his owne, and which he hath not * *yet receiv'd,* must needs belong unto him as a man; because the place where he now sits, is the Fathers Throne ; a Throne in which he hath no proper interest, but as God. Againe, it followes, that seeing he is now in his Fathers Throne, therefore neither is this the time, nor that the place, in which his Throne is to be erected: not the place, for in one Kingdome there can be but one Throne: and not the time, for then he should sit in his own throne, which now he doth not doe: and the reason of it (as is intimated in the first words) is because the time in which all that shall overcome, are to be call'd, is not yet at an end, and this also the answer which was made to the soules under the Altar (who cried for vengeance against their persecutors) doth full confirme ; for it was said unto them, *that they should yet rest for a little season, untill their fellow servants also, and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled : Rev.* the 6. and the 11. *vers.* and when this is done,† then shall Christ sit in his owne Throne, and they that overcome shall sit with him ; *for he that overcometh, and keepeth my words unto the end, to him* (saith he) *will I give power over nations (and he shall rule them with a rod of iron, as the vessels of a Potter shall they be broken to shivers) even as I received of my Father, Rev.* 2. at the 26. *vers.* The like encouragement he gave also to his Disciples before his passion. *Yee are they* (said he) *which have continued with me in my temptations, therefore I appoint unto you a Kingdome, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may* ‡ *eate and drinke at my table in my* § *Kingdome, and sit on* || *seates judging the Twelve Tribes of* Israel, *Luke* the 22. at the 28. *vers.* I know these words are taken by interpreters, for a metaphoricall expression of those joyes which we shall receive in ¶ Heaven ; but it is a currant

* *Col.* 2. *v.* 15. † *Eph.* 4. *v.* 8. ‡ *Col.* 2. *v.* 10.
§ *Heb.* 1. *v.* 3 ; *ch.* 8. *v.* 1 ; *ch.* 10. *v.* 12 ; *ch.* 12. *v.* 2. || *Phil.* 3. *v.* 21.
* *Heb.* 2. *v.* 8 ; *ch.* 10. *v.* 12. 13. † *Rev.* 11. *v.* 15. 17.
‡ *Mat.* 26. *v.* 29 ; *Mar.* 14. *v.* 25 ; *Luke* 14. *v.* 15 ; *ch.* 22. *v.* 16. 18 ; *ch.* 24. *v.* 42. 43 ; *Act.* 10. *v.* 41.
§ *Dan.* 2. *v.* 44 ; *ch.* 7. *v.* 14. 27. || *Dan.* 7. *v.* 22 ; *Rev.* 20. *v.* 4.
¶ In Heaven where the holy *Ierusalem* is, that (*Rev.* 21. *v.* 10.) great City, distinguished from the City described to (*Ezek.* 40. *v.* 2. *&c. ch.* 45. *v.* 1, 2, 3, 4,

Digitized by Google

axiom in our Schooles (*non esse à literâ, seu propriâ Scripturæ significatione recedendum, nisi evidens aliqua necessitas cogat, et Scripturæ veritas in ipsâ literâ periclitari videtur*) that wee must not forsake the literall and proper sense of the Scripture, unlesse an evident necessity doth require it, or the truth thereof would be endangered by it: and I am sure, here is no such cause for which we should leave the naturall interpretation of the place: yea, we are by many other passages in the Scriptures rather compel'd to sticke to it; for besides that there is little analogy and resemblance betwixt a perpetuall * praising and worshipping of God, and the businesse of a politicke government here spoken of; besides this I say, we are already inform'd, that though our Saviour be now in Heaven, yet he sits not there in his owne Throne, and consequently, is not yet in the Kingdome which the Father hath appointed him.

"You see againe, that when our Saviour comes to reigne over all the earth, he comes not alone, but brings all the Saints with him. Which words as they doe establish the literall sense of the † first Resurrection, mentioned in the 20. Chap. of the *Rev.* So they make the Kingdome of *Israel*, and the thousand yeares reigne of the Saints there spoken of, to sunchronize and meete together, for why shall the Saints come with him, but because they have a share in this Kingdome, and are to be his assistants in it, as he told his Disciples; and as the Elders in the

5, 6, 7.) *Ezekiel*, (which I take to be the modell and platforme of the City that is to be built at the *Iewes* Redemption,) by these and many more differences. First, because the (*Heb.* 11. *v.* 10.) builder and maker of the one is God, but the other (*Ier.* 31. *v.* 38; *Ezek. ch.* 40. *&c.*) men shall build. Secondly, the materials of *Ierusalem* which is above, are all (*Rev.* 21. *v.* 18, 19, 20, 21.) gold and precious stones. But the (*Ezek.* 41. *v.* 16, 17, 21, *&c.*) materials of that other *Ierusalem* shall not be such. Thirdly, in this City, there is (*Rev.* 21. *v.* 22.) no Temple, *for the Lord God Almighty, and the Lambe are the Temple of it.* But that City shall have (*Ezek.* 40. 41. *&c.*) a Temple. Fourthly, the river of (*Rev.* 22, *v.* 1.) water of life proceedeth out of the Throne of God, and of the Lambe. But in that City, (*Ezek.* 47, *v.* 1, *&c.*) waters, (not the river of life,) though endued with healthfull and (*Ezek.* 47, *v.* 9, 12.) nourishing qualities, (because of the place whence they are to proceed) *shall issue from under the threshold of the Temple: for the forefront of the house shall stand towards the East, and the waters shall come downe from under the right side of the house, at the South side of the Altar.* Fifthly, in this City, the tree of life (*Rev.* 22. *v.* 2.) onely growes on either side of the river, and beares twelve manner of fruits monthly. But by the river, that shall issue out of the Sanctuary of that City, shall grow (*Ezek.* 47. *v.* 12.) all trees for meat. Sixthly, in this City there is (*Rev.* 22. *v.* 5; *ch.* 21. *v.* 23. 25.) no night, they need no candle, nor light of the Sunne, *for the Lord God giveth them light, and the Lambe is the light thereof.* But in that City, there shall be no (*Esa.* 30. *v.* 26. *ch.* 60. *v.* 11.) night, and the light of the Sunne shall then be sevenfold. Seventhly, this City shall (*Rev.* 21. *v.* 1. 2.) descend to the new earth, with which there shall be no sea created. But the waters which shall come from that City, shall goe into the (*Ezek.* 47. *v.* 8.) sea, and being brought forth into the sea the warters shall be healed, &c. and therefore that City is to be built before the annihilation of the first earth, with which there is a sea.

* *Rev.* 22, *v.* 3.

† *Luk.* 14. *v.* 14; *ch.* 20. *v.* 35. 36. *Ioh.* 6. *v.* 39. 40. 44, 45; *Philip.* 3. *v.* 11. 1 *Thes.* 3. *v.* 13.; *ch.* 4. *v.* 14. &c.; *Ezek.* 37. *v.* 12, 13.

Digitized by Google

5. Chap. of the *Rev.* at the 10. ver. said in the hearing of Saint *John*, *Thou hast made us unto our God Kings, and Priests, and we* * *shall* † *reigne on earth.* And this will appeare to a diligent eye, even out of the controversed place in the 20. Chap. of the *Rev.* for besides, that the opposition betwixt the first and the last Resurrection, doth impose the same sense on both ; besides this, I say, the vision represented not unto Saint *John*, perfect men (at the first) that is, men that should be beheaded for the *witness of Jesus ;* but soules onely, and that as of men already beheaded : which most manifestly shewes, that the Resurrection after mentioned, did follow their death, and not goe before it. And therefore may not be taken spiritually, for their regeneration, for the renewing of their mindes, which is to precede their persecution (and may more probably be referred to the sealing of the Servants of God in their foreheads, spoken of in the 7. Chap.) but materially and properly, for the quickning of their bodies, when once the number of the persecuted is fulfilled : whose consummation and glorious exaltation, this vision did represent. It is said also, that they *Lived and Reigned* with Christ *a thousand yeares.* But how can it be, that they should reigne immediately after their resurrection ; or begin their reigne all at once ; or continue it but a thousand yeares, (which things these words imply) if by their *Resurrection*, should be understood their *Regeneration :* and by their *reigne*, their *being in Heaven*, or if by the Word [*they lived*] should be meant onely, *they were converted ;* how can they reigne so long as a thousand yeares, seeing the place of their reigne must be on earth ? for if they should be any where else, how can they be encompast againe with war, when the thousand yeares are expired, as the 9. ver. declares they shall ? and lastly, the reigne of Christ doth not begin, till Antichrist is destroyed, so that a metaphorical interpretation of the first resurrection, would make good this Conclusion, that most of the Saints shall rise many hundred yeares before their Reigne ; their being no less distance of time betwixt the houre of their calling and Antichrists confusion."

* *Sanctorum super terram regia dignitas et auctoritas in hoc mundi statu nulla est; Sed exilium et perpetuæ calamitates ac persecutiones, quas a tyrannis mundi hujus regilus patiuntur. De altero igitur mundi statu hoc accipiendum. Quod si vero super terram regnabunt Sancti, utique ea non abolebitur, vel annihilabitur : in id enim quod non est, creaturæ dominium non est. Eodem videtur Christus respexisse.* Mat. 5. v. 5. *Est et hoc observandum, quod Sancti ajunt, regnabimus, non, regnamus. Quo digitum intendunt ad alterum seculum. Nam ne Sancti quidem in cœlo constituit, jam regnant super terram : quia cum patientia adhuc expectant liberationem fratrum, quam accelerare non possunt.* Apoc. 6. v. 10, 11. They are the words of *Mar. Frid. Wendelinus* (page 429, 430. of the 21 ch. of the 2. Sect. of his naturall contemplations) urged in defence of an accidentall change of the world against the essentiall abolition of it.

† *Rom.* 4. *v.* 13. ; *Luk.* 19. v. 17. 19.

Digitized by Google

The Mount of Spirits, that Glorious and Honourable State to which Believers are called by the Gospel, Explained in some Meditations upon Heb. xii. 18—24. London. 1691.

"WHO can imagine that the creation shall always groan under bondage to the lusts and passions of men, and not at last again put on its beautiful garments, and in a right and due manner be serviceable to that end (which was the use and delight of man while he lived in communion with his God), for which it was originally made? This restoration will be accomplished at Christ's second coming, for then will be the great jubilee the creation has so long groaned after."—P. 62.

Upon Isaiah lxv.; "the wolf and lamb shall feed together," &c.:—"I conceive this text is to be literally understood, and cannot fairly be taken otherwise for divers considerable reasons. Because the time to which this prophecy relates, and in which it is to be accomplished, is when there shall be a new heavens and a new earth; and what more proper to conceive than that when the heavens and earth are to be new, the creatures should have new qualities and conditions? It is plain so to be, if you look back to the seventeenth verse, 'Behold I create new heavens,' &c.; and from thence to the twenty-fifth and last verse, is a perfect description of the state of this new heaven and earth, and the happy condition the creatures shall be restored unto. This new heaven and new earth is to be at Christ's second coming, when the restitution of all things is to be; for the new heavens and new earth and the restitution of all things, in Scripture phrase, are the same; and what time so likely, so fit and proper for this to be effected as then. The other prophecy of this matter in the eleventh chapter, in these words (verse 6) 'the wolf shall dwell with the lamb,' &c., is to be when knowledge shall cover the earth; which is but an expression of the same time before mentioned in other words, it shall be when Christ shall come and shall set all to rights. * * * * 'Twill be hard with any tolerable and sober sense, to put a mystical and metaphorical meaning upon these passages, and those that have attempted it, have much justified the literal interpretation by their misfortune in the attempt; and if it seem necessary to take any part of the prophecy literally, it will be a probable ground to suppose the whole ought to be so taken."—P. 65.

"It will be with the Church in the last period of the world, as it was with the disciples when they went to Emmaus, Christ will open their understandings and give them a clear view of the Scriptures, and of all things therein touching himself and the glory of His kingdom, and the restitution of all things."—P. 66.

"The scope of St. Paul in this place seems clearly to be this, that the creature being under a curse, and under a preternatural subjection and usage not suitable to its first make and designment by reason of man's sin, and being unwillingly subjected thereunto, did in its way dislike it, groaned to be delivered from it, and naturally tended to its primitive state and use which it was to be restored unto, when the sons

Digitized by Google

of God should be manifested, and Christ should set up his glorious kingdom here upon earth."—P. 68.

"His appearing again will be in those times wherein all things shall be restored; whatever is defiled, defaced and disordered and misplaced by sin, shall be reduced in those times to its primitive beauty and order, as a very particular effect of Christ's redemption; and they are called times of restitution, because they will precede and last sometime before the day of judgment, which is usually expressed in Scripture by one positive determinate day; the day of judgment to all good men will be much more than a restitution, it will bring them to a far better state than ever they were made in; but these are called times of restitution of all things, when not only men but all the creation shall partake of the benefits of these times. And these restoring times are such as God hath spoken of by all his prophets; all or most of them have some way or other, more or less mentioned this glorious kingdom of Christ towards the end of the world."

Speech of Dr. Capadose, of Amsterdam.

Great and blessed was the epoch when the light of the Reformation broke through the darkness which covered the Christian Church; the task, the calling of the Reformation, she has fulfilled. That which every soul must possess and acknowledge, in order to experience a well-grounded hope of salvation, even in the hour of death, the Reformation brought out to view, buried, as it had been, under the rubbish of Papal indulgences. She taught, more clearly than ever, how deeply, how hopelessly man is fallen; being dead, not merely in appearance, but dead in reality, in trespasses and sins. She taught how man, through sovereign grace, according to the eternal election of God, is renewed and regenerated by the Holy Ghost; justified before God, by faith alone, without works; the righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ, his surety and Mediator, being imputed to him. She taught how such a sinner, justified in Christ, is sanctified by the indwelling Spirit of God, to be conformed to the image of God's Son. In a word, the entire doctrine of salvation, and everything appertaining to the spiritual kingdom of the Redeemer, has been set forth by our Reformers with so much clearness and scriptural authority—with so much fulness and simplicity—that what we possess concerning this glorious doctrine, in the principal Confessions of the Reformation, needs to undergo, even in our days, and notwithstanding the extension of knowledge and science, scarcely any alteration whatever. This was her calling, appointed her by God, and she fulfilled it. But, if we now read the writings of those great men concerning those Prophecies which are as yet unfulfilled, we see clearly that the examination and development of that part of the Word of God was reserved for a later period than theirs. It is true, from time to time, a voice has been heard in different lands, which has more fully elucidated the Prophecies which are yet unfulfilled; but it is an incontrovertible fact, that it is

Digitized by Google

only within the last fifty years that the knowledge of the eschatology, or the doctrine of the last things, has made any remarkable progress; and it cannot be denied that, as generally happens with respect to subjects veiled in futurity, men, when treating on the Millennium, have aimed at too much precision, and entered with excessive minuteness into the slightest details, instead of being satisfied with those grand outlines and principal features which are clearly discernible. Still it is evident to the prayerful investigator of the Prophets, that the visible return of the Lord to reign as King, and the restoration of Israel to their own country, are both taught in the Word of God. Men celebrated for their faith and scientific developments, living in different countries, but especially in Great Britain, so richly blessed, have remarked and pointed out the partial manner of expounding the Prophecies, which has prevailed even from the times of the Reformation. It has been customary, whenever mention is made in the Scriptures of the prosperity, blessedness, and the glory of Israel, to understand these passages in a spiritual sense, and to apply them exclusively to the Christian Church; but, on the contrary, whenever threats and punishments are announced, to understand them literally, and apply them to the descendants of Abraham. In your country, but especially in England, eloquent protestations have been made against such a mode of interpretation, and a sounder and more judicious explanation of the Prophecies has been proposed; but up to this day no Church has directed its special attention, as a Church, to this important part of Divine truth. This was left for the better days that were to rise over the Protestant Churches. Let a Committee, chosen from among you, occupy themselves specially with this very important subject; so that in your excellent Church Confession an additional article may be found, in which a belief of the restoration of Israel to the land of their inheritance, and the personal reign of King Jesus in glory, before the day of judgment is acknowledged.

CHARLES WESLEY'S MILLENNARIANISM.

The Millennarianism of Augustus Toplady is known we suppose to most of our readers. He made no scruple to avow it. Toplady was a Calvinist.

One of his contemporaries and opponents was John Fletcher, of Madely. He too was a millennarian;—just as decidedly so as Toplady. His sentiments also, are upon record. Fletcher was an Arminian.

Another of the worthies of that day was Charles Wesley. As to his opinions on the above doctrine we shall make no decided averment, for we are not so fully acquainted with his prose writings

Digitized by Google

as to enable us to give any definite statement of his millennarianism. But in the year 1762 he published two volumes with the following title, "Short Hymns on Select Passages of the Holy Scriptures. By Charles Wesley, M.A." From these two volumes we mean to give a few extracts, that our readers may form their own judgment as to Mr. C. Wesley's opinions. We are not aware that any minister of the Wesleyan body is a pre-millennialist, nor have we ever seen any work upon that subject by a member of that body. Still we are sure they will not refuse to consider the quotations which we are about to give. They are not to be led by any mere human guide, however venerated; yet still the sentiments of one of their truly great men are worth pondering. It is evident that the subject was one with which he was familiar. It seems to have been much before his mind, for he often refers to it, sometimes more and sometimes less explicitly, but still always in the same strain.

Thus he paraphrases Job xix. 25, "I know that my Redeemer liveth:"—

"I call the world's Redeemer mine;
He lives, who died for me, I know,
Who bought my soul with blood divine;—
Jesus shall re-appear below,
Stand in that dreadful day unknown,
And fix on earth his heavenly throne."

Isaiah ii. 17, he thus expounds:—

"Son of man, we long to see
Thy last and brightest day;
When, oh, when shall all things be
Subjected to thy sway?
On all flesh thy spirit shower,
That every soul its Lord may own,
Seated in full glorious power
On thy millennial throne."

The next is yet more decided than either of the preceding. It is Christ himself who is represented as speaking. He is proclaiming his glorious advent and the kingdom which is then to be established. It is on Isaiah xlix. 23:—

"Then, Sion, thou shalt fully know
The King of kings revealed below,
In glorious majesty divine.
Righteous and true and good I am,
Jehovah-Jesus is my name,
Thy God in Christ for ever thine.
Expecting me on earth to reign,
My people shall not wait in vain;
But saved and perfected in one,
Shall see me come triumphant back,
My train increase, my joy partake,
And share mine everlasting throne."—Vol. i. p. 358.

Digitized by Google

On Isaiah lix. 19, we have the following stanza :—

"Every joyful tongue shall sing,
Jehovah shining in the Son,
Christ the universal King,
On his millennial throne."—Vol. i. p. 372.

On Isaiah lx. 13, he thus writes, in language which implies how *literally* he was disposed to interpret these prophecies of Messiah's advent and glory and kingdom :—

"That place where once I walked below,
On Olivet I will appear :
My bleeding feet to Israel shew,
While those who pierced, behold me near.
Again I will forsake my throne,
And to my footstool earth descend ;
And fill the earth with peace unknown,
With glorious joy that ne'er shall end."—Vol. i. p. 378.

It is evident that he understood *literally* the promise of the new heavens and earth in the concluding chapters of Isaiah. Thus he sings, (Is. lxv. 17) :—

"Come, divine effectual power,
Fallen nature to restore ;
Wait we for thy presence here,
Long to see thy throne appear ;
Bid the new creation rise,
Bring us back our Paradise.

"Now our universe create
Fair beyond its first estate,
When thine eyes with pleasure viewed,
When thy lips pronounced it good :
Ruined now by sin and curst,
Speak it fairer than at first."—Vol. i. p. 383.

Thus he celebrates the restoration of Israel in the latter day :—

"We know it must be done,
For God hath spoke the word,
All Israel shall their Saviour own,
To their first state restored.
Rebuilt by his command,
Jerusalem shall rise ;
Her temple on Moriah stand
Again, and touch the skies."—Vol. i. p. 392.

His translations of the other prophets are no less explicit than those we have quoted from Isaiah. The thoughts that we have already noticed run through the whole work. Ezekiel xxxvii. 24, is thus paraphrased :—

"Father, now to Israel raise
Thy servant and thy Son,
Christ, our heavenly David, place
On his terrestrial throne."—Vol. ii. p. 56.

H

Digitized by Google

And, again, the succeeding verse of the same chapter is thus given :—

"When the house of Jacob's sons
Their Canaan repossess,
Shall not all thy chosen ones
Abide in perfect peace?
Trusting in the literal word
We look for Christ on earth again.
Come, our everlasting Lord,
With all thy saints to reign."—Vol. ii. p. 56.

In the following stanza we have a repetition of the same idea, and in the last line of it a peculiar opinion, which he seems to have entertained in common with a few others, that at the end of the thousand years, Christ and his saints were to return back again to heaven. It is a paraphrase of Ezekiel xxxix. 29 :—

"*When wilt thou on thy throne appear*
Triumphant with thine ancients here,
While various crowns thy brow adorn.
Then shall the saints thy glory see,
Till time commence eternity,
And all with thee to heaven return."—Vol. ii. p. 57.

On the second chapter of Daniel, he brings out his Millennarianism again :—

"Lord, as taught by thee, we pray
That sin and death may end;
In the great Millennial day,
With all thy saints descend."—Vol. ii. p. 59.

Again, in the twelfth chapter, we have the following stanza :—

"Dismissed, I calmly go my way
Which leads me to the tomb,
And rest in hope of that great day,
When my desire shall come.
Happy *with those that first arrive,*
Might I my lot obtain,
When Christ descending from the skies,
Begins his glorious reign."—Vol. ii. p. 64.

Thus he pleads for the coming of the King :—

"Come no more a man of woe,
Come, and all thy grandeur show;
King of kings, *appear again,*
Glorious with thine ancients reign."—Vol. ii. p. 100.

On the fourteenth of Zechariah he has several hymns, all breathing the same tone :—

"Come, my God Jehovah, come,
With all thy saints appear;
Antichrist expects his doom,
And we thy kingdom here.
* * * * * *

Digitized by Google

"Thee Jesus, Lord of lords we know,
The kingdoms of the earth are thine;
Hasten t' erect thy throne below,
That last great monarchy divine."—P. 115.

In his hymns on Malachi, we find the same truths embodied. Even the coming of Elijah seems to form part of his prophetic creed:—

"Once he in the Baptist came,
And virtue's paths restored;
Pointed sinners to the Lamb.—
Forerunner of his Lord
Sent again from Paradise,
Elijah shall the tidings bring;
'Jesus comes! ye saints arise,
And meet your heavenly King.'"—P. 123.

And again, upon the same theme he thus expresses himself:—

"Previous to the dreadful day
Which shall thy foes consume,
Jesus, to prepare thy way,
Let the last prophet come.
When the seventh trumpet's sound,
Proclaims the grand Sabbatic year:
Come thyself, with glory crowned,
And reign triumphant here."—P. 123.

And again,—

"Yes, we know our Lord will come,
Smite the Antichrist of Rome;
All his plagues and judgments pour,
Earth accurst with fire devour!
But the curse shall soon remove,
But the Incarnate God of love,
Sitting on his throne shall show,
Earth renewed is heaven below."—P. 123.

He thus enlarges upon the expression in the twenty-fourth of Matthew, "as lightning shall the coming of the Son of man be":—

"Quick as the darted lightning flies,
Flashing at once throughout the skies,
Saviour, thou wilt on earth appear,
To 'stablish thy dominion here.

"*Before the final general doom,*
We know thou wilt to judgment come,
Thy foes destroy, thy friends maintain,
And glorious with thine ancients reign."—P. 185.

His hymn on Heb. ix. 28, thus concludes:—

"Come then, our Heavenly Friend,
Sorrow and death to end;
Pure Millennial joy to give.
Now appear on earth again,
Now thy people saved receive,
Now begin thy glorious reign."—P. 362.

Digitized by Google

A similar pleading we have in the hymn on Rev. i. 5 :—

" Jesus, let thy kingdom come,
(Inspired by thee we pray),
Previous to the general doom,
The everlasting day."—P. 414.

* * * * * * *

" Resolved to toil and suffer on,
Till thou the second time appear,
Ascend thy bright Millennial throne,
And reign the King of glory here."—P. 418.

* * * * * * *

" So when thou shalt on earth appear,
To fix thy heavenly kingdom here,
I shall with my Redeemer join,
Partake the victory divine;
And clothed with thy resistless power,
The conqueror of the world adore."—P. 418.

Our last is from the hymn on Rev. v. 10, " We shall reign on the earth" :—

" Mightier joys ordained to know,
When thou com'st to reign below,
We shall at thy side sit down;
Partners of thy great white throne,
Kings a thousand years with thee,
Kings through all eternity."—P. 425.

Such are some specimens of Charles Wesley's Millennarianism. Our object in citing them, is neither comment nor criticism. We are content with having simply laid them before our readers. Perhaps some members of the Wesleyan body may be led by these extracts to inquire fully into the whole question. What Church or what saint can decline such an inquiry and be guiltless?

Digitized by Google

Correspondence.

(*To the Editor of the " Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."*)

Sir,—I wish to address to you, or rather to those who are about to become your readers, a few lines of an encouraging nature upon your entering upon a work calculated in itself, I am satisfied, to be of the greatest utility to the Church of Christ at this critical period.

The past experience of the Church may well have given rise to the discouraging idea that there is something essentially difficult in the interpretation of prophecy, and especially of that important section of it, the Apocalypse of St. John, but I am persuaded that this will be found to be altogether a false idea, and that when it shall please God to remove that veil from the mind of the Church which has hitherto obscured its perception, it will appear to be perfectly clear and intelligible, and that the wonder and admiration of the Church will then be properly directed to this point, how so much past obscurity could have been rendered by Divine wisdom compatible with so much present perspicuity.

As it would be highly encouraging in reference to the hoped for result of your labours, if such an idea as to the true nature and character of the Apocalypse could be entertained by yourself and your readers, I will beg to make a few remarks which may account for the failure of every attempt hitherto made to give a satisfactory interpretation of it. And I trust that they will be such as will commend themselves to the common sense of your readers, or if otherwise, that their fallacy will be pointed out, for I am persuaded that you will not be satisfied that your publication should be a mere collection of heterogeneous matter, having no reference to any general system of interpretation, but that you will endeavour to promote such discussion amongst your contributors, and pursue such a course in your own endeavours to elucidate the subject, as shall lead to some general final and satisfactory result.

In explanation then of the causes of the failure of every attempt that has been hitherto made to give a general and satisfactory interpretation of the Apocalypse, I would lay it down as a maxim that prophecy is but history anticipated, and that as any history written without reference to chronological arrangement would be an obscure jumble, so an historical prophecy interpreted as if it were so written, cannot possibly produce any other result. This observation will be found applicable to the three distinct histories of the seals, trumpets, and little opened book, of which the Apocalypse consists, the true interpretation of each of which can only be given upon the principle of strict chronological arrangement. If then it should be manifest, beginning with the seals, that all commentators have in their interpretations committed a gross violation of chronological arrangement, we need go no farther in our endeavours to account for the hitherto unsatisfactory character of all Apocalyptic interpretation.

Now it is a fact, of which every reader of prophecy must be cognisant, that the first six seals are considered as contained in the vith chapter of the Apocalypse, and that the viith chapter terminates with the vision of the eternal state, and so far all is correct; but when they farther suppose that the viiith chapter contains the events, or part of the events of the seventh seal, they obviously in giving the events of the seven seals, are led into the greatest possible chronological error, by introducing in their interpretation eternity into the midst of time, that is, in the midst between the events described under the sixth seal and those supposed to be described under the seventh.

Having shewn the root of the evil, I should consider it as time wasted and attention misdirected, were I to proceed to point out all the various anomalies which manifest themselves continually in every part of the interpretations usually given of the Apocalypse as resulting from this original error. The

really important question is, How can it be corrected? and here my answer is, that nothing can be more simple: it requires no ingenuity in the commentator to discover the true interpretation, but simply a just confidence in his subject. To him who believes the word of prophecy to be sure and perfect, it will be found to be sure and perfect, while he who treats it unworthily, and has not due confidence in it, must hope for no success in explaining its meaning.

A simple-minded commentator, duly appreciating the perfection of the divine subject before him, will feel confident that, when he has arrived at the vision of eternity, he has come to the termination of the first history of the seals. He cannot fail, also, to see on other grounds, that the first six verses of the eighth chapter form a preface to a new history contained in the voices of the seven trumpets; and with respect to the opening of the seventh seal, being thus announced in a different history from its own, he will find this to be in perfect analogy with the case of the sounding of the seventh trumpet, which is noticed by all critical commentators as being announced, not in his own history, that of the seven trumpets, but in the subsequent history of the little opened book. So that this modern discovery of the opening of the seventh seal being mentioned, not in its own history (at Rev. vii. 1, where it really occurs), but in the subsequent trumpet history (Rev. viii. 1), while it removes every other difficulty in Apocalyptic interpretation, is in itself no new difficulty, but is perfectly analogous to the sounding of the seventh trumpet, which really taking place at Rev. x. 1, is omitted there in its own history, and is mentioned by way of compensation out of its own history, in the subsequent one of the little opened book, Rev. xi. 15.

It would be going beyond my present purpose, which is only that of vindicating the character of the Apocalypse by bringing home to every preceding commentator a case of obvious chronological misarrangement, were I to explain the cause of the omissions of the seventh seal and seventh trumpet where they really occur, and the mention by way of compensation, of their having occurred in other and subsequent histories: suffice it to say that, while the fact alone was known by former commentators in one of the instances (that of the seventh trumpet), and the cause of it was unknown, or only erroneously conjectured, the modern discovery finds the cases of the seventh seal and seventh trumpet to be similar to each other, and finds also an adequate cause for this peculiarity alike applicable to each case.

It is not my present purpose to do more than endeavour to remove the impression that, because commentators have hitherto failed in their attempts to interpret the Apocalypse, they must, therefore, be expected to continue to fail in any future attempt; it being obvious, that if the Apocalypse is anything like that perfect work which we must believe it to be, commentators commencing their interpretations in the way they have uniformly done, could not do otherwise than fail. I will, however, add farther, that the same straightforward system of chronological interpretation, recommencing a new history only where the text manifestly directs such recommencement, reveals the whole book of the Apocalypse to consist of three parts; the greater book containing the two parallel histories of the western and eastern branches of the Roman empire, given respectively under the seven seals and the seven trumpets, and "the little opened book" containing, thirdly, the history of the Church; after which comes a supplement of the seven vials of wrath, as being common to all three histories, and the book is concluded by three interpretations by the angel of the three preceding histories following one another in the same order of subjects as the three main histories themselves to which they respectively belong.

This view of the Apocalypse, which presents it before us as a perfect whole, I must observe is supported by various remarkable texts to be considered (according to the invaluable rule of the celebrated Mede) as indications of the designed and proper arrangement of the several parts of which it consists. Thus the parallel texts, Rev. xvii. 1, and xxi. 9, commencing each with the same words, "and there came unto me one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, and talked

Digitized by Google

with me ;"—mark the parallel commencements of the interpretations given by the angel, of the two principal subjects of the book, viz., the civil history of the Western Roman Empire, and the history of the Church ; and the parallel terminations of these portions of the prophecy, are in like manner marked by the corresponding texts, Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 8, " And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which showed me these things ; and he said unto me, See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow-servant : worship God." The termination of the three interpretations by the angel of the three preceding histories, is farther marked by the parallel texts of Rev. xix. 9, xxi. 5, and xxii. 6,—" These are the true sayings of God,"—" These words are true and faithful,"—" These sayings are faithful and true,"—respectively confirmatory of the truth of the three distinct histories of which the book of the Apocalypse consists. In short, I may safely say, that the true arrangement of the Apocalypse, as pointed out by these indications, is unquestionable and undeniable ; and further, that there is but one possible interpretation which can be chronologically given of it when so correctly arranged, ; you would oblige me, therefore, by informing me, whether any commentator who has written since 1826, when these and other texts of a like nature were fully brought before them (Mr. Elliott, for instance ; and I mention him as the most popular and copious writer on the subject who has recently appeared), has in any edition of his works which I may have overlooked, noticed these texts ; if otherwise, I would beg in the name of the public, and through the medium of your publication, to call upon him for an explanation of their supposed import ; without which, I think I may be allowed to say, that neither he nor any other commentator can be considered as having done justice to his subject.

I will only make one other observation, which is to me, and I think may be to you and to the public at large, of an encouraging nature in reference to the hoped for opening of prophetic interpretation. From the year 1813, when the Apocalyptic system above referred to was first opened to my mind, to the year 1822, when the 1290 years of Daniel terminated, the period was filled with the events of the latter part of the fourth, and the whole of the fifth and sixth vials of wrath, bringing constant confirmation of the truth of the system. The subsequent period of twenty-five years from 1822 to 1847, forming a preface to and preparation only for the seventh vial, and containing only events taking place in the Protestant British Church, has been consequently, though equally confirmatory to myself, yet less generally striking in its character. But with the Continental Revolution of 1848, has begun the outpouring of the seventh vial, calculated by the magnitude and importance of the events it contains to arrest the attention of all, and direct it to the subject of the prophetic Scriptures ; imperiously calling also for labours similar to those in which I trust you are about successfully to engage.

In the hope that you will receive these very hastily written lines as evidences of my good-will, and of the interest I take in your projected work,

I remain, &c.

JAS. HATLEY FRERE.

September 9, 1848.

Digitized by Google

THE CHANGE.

"We, which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air."—1 Thess. iv. 7.

I.

I LOVE on pale blue sky; it is the floor
Of that glad home where I shall shortly be;
A home from which I shall go out no more;
From toil and grief and vanity set free.

II.

I gaze upon yon everlasting arch,
Up which the bright stars wander, as they shine;
And as I mark them in their nightly march,
I think how soon that journey shall be mine!

III.

Yon silver drift of dewy cloud, far up
In the still heaven,—through you my pathway lies.
Yon rugged mountain-peak,—how soon your top
Shall I behold beneath me, as I rise!

IV.

Not many more of life's slow-pacing hours,
Shaded with sorrow's melancholy hue;—
Oh, what a glad ascending shall be ours,
Oh, what a pathway up yon starry blue!

V.

A journey like Elijah's, swift and bright,
Caught gently upward to an early crown,
In heaven's own chariot of all-blazing light,*
With death untasted and the grave unknown.

* θείῳ πυρὶ παμφαῆς. Soph.

NOTICE.

All contributions to be addressed to the publishers. None can be attended to or returned to which the author's name is not attached, or given separately, in confidence.

All readers of this Journal are most earnestly besought to give it room in their prayers; that by means of it God may be honoured and his truth advanced: also, that it may be conducted in faith and love, with sobriety of judgment and discernment of the truth, in nothing carried away into error, or hasty speech, or sharp, unbrotherly disputation.

ERRATUM.—At page 15, line 2, for παλιγγενησια, read παλιγγενεσια.

Macintosh, Printer, Great New Street, London.

Digitized by Google

THE QUARTERLY

JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

JANUARY, 1849.

Art. I.—THE APOSTOLICITY OF CHILIASM.

The history of a doctrine is a matter of some consequence as well as of some interest. The authority of man, it is true, in a matter of belief is nought. His affirmation (whether it be the "universal tradition" of Popery or the "universal consciousness" of philosophy) cannot render a doctrine, by one hairbreadth, more or less true. If it be true, his disbelieving cannot make it false; if it be false, his belief cannot transmute it into true. That which is true stands just as thoroughly independent of human authentication as does the shining of a star in the firmament, whose brightness is totally independent of the eyes that look upon it, or the hearts that are cheered by its guidance. Pre-eminently, this may be affirmed of scriptural truth—that truth, whose foundation is exclusively God's revelation, apart from probabilities or arguments or numbers.

Still, formed as we are for brotherhood, and linked together, alike in mind and sympathy, we cannot help being swayed and influenced by the opinions of others. Besides, our fellow-men are entitled to some *deference* though not to *submission*. They are entitled to be *consulted* though not obeyed. Was it not with some such feeling that Paul, when he went up to Jerusalem, communicated individually with them that were of note in the Church, "lest by any means he should run or had run in vain." (Gal. ii. 2.) This of itself makes the history of a doctrine of some importance.

And then, as to the *interest* of the subject, every one feels that this is of no feeble kind. The ancestry of a truth in all its various stages must possess an interest more than enough

Digitized by Google

to requite all labour of research. We like to know in whose footsteps we are treading, and in whose company we are believing. A truth, however precious in itself, does, irresistibly, acquire fresh value in our eyes as we trace it back age after age, and find how many saints, how many martyrs held it as we do. Besides,

> There is a consecrating power in time,
> And what is grey with years to man seems godlike.

But we can sometimes claim for a doctrine more than all this. We can so trace it backward, so put together the fragments of its genealogical table, as to connect it directly with its inspired promulgators. This has been done in the case of the *Trinity* and in that of the *Sabbath*, as well as in others. The doctrine for which this can be done is one which we must of necessity find some difficulty in rejecting.

There are two ways in which we may arrive at a knowledge of a man's opinions. Say he were a teacher or professor who had been taken from us; his writings form the first, the most direct, the most satisfactory. The second is,—his pupils and companions. When any difficulty arises as to his meaning on some particular point, we betake ourselves to those that heard him, that knew him, that had conversed with him. When their testimony is explicit and unanimous, we feel assured that the meaning in which they unite is the genuine and the true. We feel as if it were impossible that it could be otherwise. Hence the importance of searching out the remote history of a scriptural doctrine. Our object in such a case is not to prove the doctrine from the traditions, but simply to prove from the traditions that it was the very doctrine held by apostles. That it was the doctrine held in the early ages of Christianity may not be of much moment *in itself*, but it is of great moment if we can carry back the doctrine to Apostolic times, and link it on to Apostolic promulgators.

Let us illustrate this point in a few sentences, for it is right that it should be clearly understood, lest it should be said that we rest on tradition as an *authority* when we merely plead for it as a *witness*.

Suppose a discussion arises as to the meaning of any one of the Thirty-nine Articles,—let it be that of justification. The Article in question seems very plainly to teach the doctrine of justification by faith alone. The more we study it the more we are convinced that no other doctrine can be elicited from it in its literal and natural sense. But a party

Digitized by Google

arises, denying that such is its meaning, and affixing a very different one. What line of argument should we adopt in opposition to such Arminian interpreters? We should first battle them upon the ground of the Article itself, going over it word by word, sentence by sentence. We should, however, feel ourselves justified in resorting to another method. We should take up the writings of the friends and contemporaries of those who framed the Article, and shew that every one of these at large had expressed himself according to our interpretation. We should produce the testimony of these who had heard these framers speak upon the very point. We should show that for many a year thereafter no other interpretation was ever heard of. We should point to the time when, and the person by whom, the false gloss was introduced. And if we could do all this, we might claim, unhesitatingly, submission to our view of the Article, as the real view of its framers. Would not this be deemed both lawful and logical? Suppose that a similar controversy were to arise in Scotland as to the meaning of the corresponding Article in the old Scotch confession composed by John Knox. We first appeal to the Article itself as clear in its meaning, insisting that the words of it shall be taken in their natural, not in their non-natural sense. Then in the further prosecution of our proof, we proceed to the writings of the Reformer's friends, who were known to reflect his sentiments faithfully. We find them of one mind in the matter. We find also that for more than a century thereafter the opposite doctrine was absolutely unknown in Scotland. We trace out the history of the opposition. We name the men, the works, the time. We find these opposers acknowledging that they were innovators—that they were putting a new construction upon the Article, contrary to the universal construction hitherto given to it—that they were still in a minority as to this construction. Finding all this, may we not reckon our cause gained, and gained, too, in a way most convincing and satisfactory?

In either of these cases could any one charge us with a superstitious veneration for tradition? Was not the use we made of it most fair and proper? We employed it only as a witness, not as an authority. We were not consulting these writers as oracles, but simply as honest men. We were not asking Jewell, or Bradford, or Ridley, what they thought of the doctrine, but what they *knew* of the sentiments of its framers. We did not go to Henderson, or Rollock, or Craig,

Digitized by Google

or Welsh, to get their authority for the doctrine, but to get their testimony as to John Knox's belief of it.

It is of some consequence to place our appeal to early testimony upon its proper footing for three reasons:—

1st. To show distinctly that we do not betake ourselves to tradition in order to establish the soundness of the doctrine. We rest nothing upon tradition as inspired or as in any degree oracular. We resort to it just as we do to the histories of the English and Scottish Reformations, in order to reach the *facts* of which it is the *transmitting* channel. Beyond this we abjure it. In so far as it is a faithful witness, we receive it, but no farther. This is the only weight we give to its *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus.*

2dly. To keep before our readers this point, viz., that it is not with the doctrine as a *theological dogma* that we have at present to do, but as a *historical fact.* We are not trying to establish either its soundness or unsoundness, but simply its existence at a particular time. The inference that we may draw from its existence in the Apostolic age must no doubt be favourable to its orthodoxy; but still this orthodoxy does not enter into the present question. It is appended as a deduction, but not introduced as an element.

3d. To make it evident that, instead of turning aside from inspired authority we are bringing our readers back to it as the only resting-place. Our ultimate object is to find out what inspired men believed. In order to do this we are surely at liberty to employ Church history. Were we to stop short of the actual Apostolic age—were we inquiring simply what Irenæus, or Tertullian, or Justin Martyr believed, in order to prop up a theory by the weight of their names, or overawe an opponent by presenting to him the verdict of reverend antiquity, we should be misleading men into the darkness of Popish error. But when the sole use that we make of the opinions of the Apostolic and post-Apostolic fathers is to exhibit what the apostles themselves believed and taught and wrote, we feel that we are doing what is lawful and profitable. We are only resorting to another method of discovering the meaning of Scripture. We are in reality making a fresh appeal to the law and to the testimony, that our faith should not stand in the wisdom of men but in the power of God.

In these remarks we have spoken of Chiliasm as a doctrine or system. For the sake of further illustration, let us call it an *interpretation of Scripture.* Of several passages of

Digitized by Google

Scripture there are two interpretations, and the question arises, which is the true? Now we maintain that Scripture is its own interpreter, and that the meaning of the passages in question is too plain to be mistaken. We maintain that they are so plain that they do not stand in need even of Apostolic authority to confirm their meaning. Yet, if it should turn out to be a fact that apostles and Apostolic men have expounded them, and thereby set their seal upon one interpretation, is not this a mighty confirmation? We are sometimes asked, did the Reformers, or did the Puritans, or did the Waldenses interpret these passages as you do? We answer, granting that we could show none of these upon our side, still we can prove that the *apostles* were. And an Apostolic interpretation is of considerably more value than even a Reformed, or a Puritan, or a Waldensian interpretation. What we claim, then, is what we may call a *Chiliastic sense* for those portions or passages of Scripture on which this controversy turns. Such is our position. The evidence of it remains, of course, to be seen. It is well, however, that our readers should thoroughly understand what our position is. We are persuaded that we have not stated it too strongly.

If the position we thus take up be correct, then, more importance ought to attach to the history of *Chiliasm* than is usually allowed. It is admitted to be a matter of curiosity, nay, of interest; but its importance has not been adverted to. Yet it is a question, the determination of which will go far to a settlement of the controversy. If we can establish the *apostolicity* of Chiliasm, we shall have done much, not merely to set aside prejudices, not merely to win a certain amount of prepossessions, but to provide the solid basis of an argument for its scripturalness and orthodoxy. Let this *apostolicity* be established from history, and how obvious, how irresistible the conclusion, that what is called Chiliasm is the doctrine of the Scripture, and according to the mind of God.

Bishop Horsley in one of his charges (1790) thus refers to the history of the doctrine of justification by faith. "That man is justified by faith without the works of the law was the uniform doctrine of the first Reformers. It is a far more ancient doctrine; it was the doctrine of the whole college of apostles. It is more ancient still; it was the doctrine of the prophets. It is older than the prophets; it was the religion of the patriarchs." What he affirmed of the doctrine of justification by faith we affirm, and are prepared to prove, *as a matter of fact*, in reference to Chiliasm. We might state it thus, after his method:—"That Christ is to come and reign with his risen saints upon the earth was the uniform doctrine of

Digitized by Google

the first fathers of the Church. It is more ancient still. It was the doctrine of the whole college of apostles. It is more ancient still. It was the doctrine of prophets. It is older than the prophets; it was the doctrine of the patriarchs. It is more ancient still; it is the doctrine taught to Adam and involved in the first promise made to him after he fell." Into the history of these different stages of its history we do not mean to enter. We go no farther back than the apostles, though the variety and fulness of Jewish traditions would enable us to trace it higher. All that we seek to demonstrate is the *apostolicity of Chiliasm.*

For demonstrating this we have considerable facilities. The doctrine is one which is very explicitly referred to by the fathers. It is not from casual hints or doubtful expressions that we are left to gather it. The testimonies are full and unequivocal, much more so on this doctrine than on several others whose apostolicity is deemed unquestionable. Justification by faith, election, the Trinity, the Sabbath, cannot produce such decided evidence from early history in their favour as Chiliasm. We are not casting any doubt upon the apostolicity of these doctrines. We believe it could be clearly proved. But it is remarkable that in reference to Chiliasm the evidence is of a kind more detailed and incontestable, evidence drawn not merely from the declarations of its supporters, but from the testimonies of its enemies, such as Jerome, in after years, when a controversy awoke respecting it.

The history of the doctrine has been most elaborately traced out by several writers, and referred to briefly in passing by many more. It is difficult to say how it has come to pass that such pains have been taken with the history of a doctrine which since the Reformation has been received by comparatively few Christians, and adopted formally in none of the Protestant confessions. Yet so it is. Not only have all Church historians noticed it (this was to be expected), but whole treatises have been given forth upon the subject, as if it were one, whose importance, or at least whose interest, demanded no common investigation. Corrodi has filled no less than four volumes with his "Geschichte des Chiliasmus." Mosheim gives considerable space to it in his "Commentarius de rebus Christianis ante Constantinum." Whitby takes it up in his "Treatise on the Millennium" and on "Traditions." P. E. Jablonski writes a work "De Regno Millennario Cerinthi." Giessler adverts to it in his "Ecclesiastical History," and Hagenbach, in his "History of Doctrines." Dr. Burton refers to it in his "Ecclesiastical History of the First Three Centuries," and more at large in

Digitized by Google

his "Bampton Lectures." Dr. Russel, late Bishop of Glasgow, has devoted a long discourse to it, consisting of about 160 pages. Besides these, there are others who more briefly notice the subject, such as Newton, Whiston, Mede, Burnet, Dodwell, &c. All the information on the history of the doctrine may be found in these. At the same time it would be well, if the reader has the opportunity, to refer to the original writers, the fathers of the first four centuries.

The writers named in the preceding page were anti-Chiliasts. They either believed in no Millennium, like Dr. Russel, or adopted the spiritualized view, like Whitby. So that they are impartial witnesses. They are not bearing witness in favour of a doctrine which they believed and sought to uphold, but are merely tracing out as a piece of curious history the notices of a doctrine which they looked upon as thoroughly exploded.

We intend, if the Lord will, to enter more fully into this subject. Meanwhile, we think it right to put our readers in possession of the sum of the whole matter as given by Dr. Russel. "So far as we view the question in reference to the sure and certain hope entertained by the Christian world, that the Redeemer would appear on earth, and exercise authority during a thousand years, there is good ground for the assertion of Mede, Dodwell, Burnet, and other writers on the same side, that down to the beginning of the fourth century the belief was universal and undisputed. . . . . . From what has been stated, it must appear manifest that the early fathers of the Christian Church believed in the doctrine of the Millennium: that they connected the expectation of it with the expiry of 6,000 years; that they looked for the personal return of the Lord Jesus Christ to reign with his chosen people in Jerusalem, surrounded with much power, magnificence, and enjoyment." *

* The above is the testimony of an enemy. It may be well to compare with it the statement of a friend. "St. John, the last of the apostles, has foretold and described the glorious reign of Christ and the saints in the very same manner that the Jews were wont to describe that of the Messiah. And, from his personal conversation, as well as from his writings, the primitive Christians derived this opinion. For Irenæus, who lived and conversed with the Apostle's immediate disciples, declares that he had learned it from those elders who had seen St. John and heard it from his mouth. And Justin Martyr testifies (who lived within thirty years of St. John's death), that it was in his time received by all true Christians, and denied by none but those who also denied the resurrection of the dead. These men are worthy all credit; they were martyrs for the Christian religion, and I can see no tolerable reason for rejecting their testimony. As it was the doctrine of primitive times that Christ should reign upon earth, so also did they believe that there would be a

Digitized by Google

Let our readers keep in mind our one object in such Articles. It is to establish the APOSTOLICITY OF CHILIASM. The evidence to this effect that we shall lay before them is full, *far fuller than can be adduced for any other doctrine.* That evidence we ask them to weigh; first, that they may determine its intrinsic validity; secondly, that they may be able to decide what deductions may be founded on it. Let no one put aside our statements as useless, even though true. What we are seeking to establish does most directly bear upon our main point, viz., the *truth* of Chiliasm. For if we can give clear evidence of its *apostolicity*, then it becomes a serious question with an opposer,—"Can a doctrine be Apostolical and yet not true?" May it be admitted that the apostles, along with the whole Church in their age, held a particular opinion, and yet that that opinion may be questioned or denied? Does undoubted apostolicity not infer absolute truth? If not, let reasons be offered for the disjunction between the two. They who maintain that a doctrine may be Apostolical and yet false, as Dr. Russel does, are bound to give their reasons for such an assertion.

It is of no avail to class such a method of proof with Popish or Tractarian sophistry. There is a wide and fixed difference between them,—a difference which a mind of fairness cannot fail to see. We utterly discard *tradition-*

renovation of the earth. . . . The opinion, therefore, that I have advanced, which is the opinion of those who are called *Millenaries*, is far from being new, since it is confirmed, in substance, by the united testimony of the ancient Heathen nations, of the Jews, and of the whole Christian Church in its earliest and purest ages. And if we consider the great probability there is that the Heathen nations derived it from some revelation earlier than the dispersion of mankind: that the Jews were a people governed and instructed by prophets divinely inspired; that our Lord himself allows their expectations in this matter to be just; that the primitive Christians (unexceptionable witnesses in this case) declare that they received this doctrine from the immediate disciples of St. John; that it is in itself reasonable, and even necessary, in order to render the redemption from the curse complete; that it is taught by many plain and express texts of Scripture, which cannot, without violence and constraint, such as no man would be allowed to use in the explanation of any human writings, be interpreted to any other purpose. If these things are duly considered, it will appear, I think, that the truth as well as antiquity of this opinion is sufficiently established; nor can I see how it possibly could have been established with more certainty. For if a multitude of Scripture texts, understood in their plain and natural sense, according also to the general tenor of the Scripture, and supported by so great an authority, be not a sufficient proof, I am entirely at a loss to know what is."—"*Sermon on the glorious Kingdom of Christ upon Earth; or, the Millennium.*" *By Robert Hort, A.M., Rector of Temple Michael, and Chaplain to his Grace Josiah, Lord Archbishop of Tuam.* 1748.

Digitized by Google

alism as an argument, yet we give weight to *apostolicity*. The difference between the two is as decided and ineffaceable as the difference between the rock and the sand. This difference has always been maintained by Protestants, and they have on all occasions proved triumphantly, that while, possibly, *traditionalism* might be on the side of their Popish adversaries, *apostolicity* was on theirs. And this we are willing, in the present controversy, to concede to anti-Chiliasts. The *tradition* of the Church from the fourth century to the present day is against us. We have had all along witnesses in our favour, age after age. But the *votes* of the Church are, in point of numbers, not with us. The first three centuries are with *us*, nearly all the rest with *them*. The Church of the apostles is with us; the Church of traditions is with them. For Popery has not only omitted Chiliasm from her creed, but testifies against it as a heresy; yet, in so doing, she finds great difficulty in setting aside what even *she* admits to be the doctrine of the Primitive Church and of the Apostolic age.

Art. II.—OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT APOCALYPSE.

The prophecy of Ezekiel may be called *Israel's Apocalypse*. It was to the Jewish Church, in many respects, what the Revelation is to us. Ezekiel spoke to Israel as the people to whom belonged the earthly glory and the earthly blessing. John spoke to the Church as the body to whom belonged the heavenly glory, and the heavenly blessing. Ezekiel wrote to Israel as the nation to whom belonged the temple and the symbols, and the land where the light of the sun would be sevenfold, and the literal city Jerusalem, in which is the throne of David; John wrote to the Church, as the community to whom pertained the Paradise of God, the new Jerusalem, the city without temple or symbol, in which is the throne of the Lamb; the land where no sun is needed, and where there shall be no more curse.

Ezekiel, then, prophesied of the earthly—John, of the heavenly. This is a distinction which it is of importance to keep in mind. There are other differences, but this is one so leading and so essential that the over-looking of it inevitably introduces confusion and darkness. There may, no doubt, be an intermingling of both the heavenly and the earthly, on

Digitized by Google

particular occasions; Ezekiel may refer to the heavenly, and John to the earthly; but still the above distinction holds good throughout, and is one which helps materially to keep us right in our interpretations. From not knowing or not attending to this, most expositors of a past age have interpreted the Old Testament prophets, as if they had solely to do with what is heavenly. In every chapter, it is *the Church* that is prophesied of! Israel according to the flesh, with all the earthly blessings in store for her, is made to occupy but a minor place, perhaps no place at all! Hence Isaiah and Ezekiel have been most thoroughly misunderstood by them, and the darkest confusion cast over every chapter. This extreme has now happily past away. Few are prepared thus to spiritualize the simple language of Old Testament prophets. But another extreme has arisen of late, no less perilous, no less darkening to the truth, but proceeding in the opposite direction. A certain class of expositors will have the Apocalypse to be *Jewish* throughout. They exclude the Church from any place in it, and hand it over to Israel entirely. Every allusion to Jewish customs, or events, or ceremonies, is laid hold of to prove the whole book to be Jewish, as if it were not a fully admitted fact, that the apostles in writing *of* Gentiles and *to* Gentiles, continually make use of Jewish phraseology, just as, occasionally, they employ Greek or Roman terms.

It is difficult to say which of these extremes is more untrue or inconsistent with the mind of God. Both are to be shunned, if prophecy is to be to us, "a light shining in a dark place." And in these days, we ought to set double watch against these tendencies to extremes, inasmuch as it now seems to be God's purpose to open up to us the Apocalypse. He is casting new light upon it, and calling on his Church to follow up the light thus vouchsafed. Sad for her, if, in such a time, she allow herself to be carried away of error!

But between the earthly and the heavenly, there is a singular *parallelism*, the earthly and the heavenly running alongside of each other; sometimes corresponding, sometimes contrasting, sometimes fitting in to each other, sometimes standing out in repulsion, but still preserving a parallelism, yet, at the same time, a firm and clear distinctiveness. This parallelism between the earthly and the heavenly, the upper and the lower, the visible and the invisible, the material and the spiritual, the local and the general, the body and the soul, runs through all Scripture. In one dispensation one of

Digitized by Google

them predominates, in another, another; yet, always, both are visible; and the mysterious co-ordination or parallelism is preserved. In the first dispensation it was the local, the visible, the earthly that was prominent; men worshipped at the gate of Eden as their temple, and on that spot was the presence of the Lord (Gen. iv. 16), the visible and local emblems of a present God. In the next dispensation, that which began with Abraham and ended with the giving of the law,—the heavenly, the invisible, and the general (or unlocal) were predominant; for Abraham and his posterity for generations were strangers and pilgrims, having but tents to dwell in, and altars reared by the way to worship in, wandering from spot to spot, without a habitation or a handbreadth of ground to call their own. In the next dispensation the prominency of the local and the visible returned. In Judaism, it is the material or earthly element that predominates, though the other is not excluded, but still preserves its parallel course. In the next dispensation (the Christian) it is the invisible, the unlocal, and the heavenly that come into view. "The hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father." (John iv. 21.) The Church's place is among the things that are heavenly and spiritual. Locality has been again dispensed with, and she is a stranger here. Visibility has been laid aside, and she walks by faith, not by sight. Thus, alternately, have these two parallel lines, along which God's purpose runs, risen and fallen. Thus has God at one time exhibited the one, and, at another, displayed the other. They have never been severed, yet they have never yet been fully presented together. They have been like the opposite sides of a revolving beacon, now presenting one light and now another. But in the next dispensation, there is to be the full exhibition of this parallelism. Both parts of it are then to come brightly into view. And such is to be the constitution of things in the millennial age, that the earthly and the heavenly, the local and the general, the material and the spiritual, shall both be manifested at once; the redeemed Church dwelling in the pavilion-cloud, or new Jerusalem, being the representative of the heavenly; Israel, and the converted nations of the world abiding in the earthly Jerusalem, and the cities of the earth, representing the earthly and the material.*

* It is curious to notice the same parallelism pervading every part of the universe. The sky and the earth,—the soul and the body, these are specimens. And the philosophical schools, idealistic and sensational, are founded in reality upon this very parallelism. The idealistic looks only at the spiritual side, forgetting that there is a corporeal, just like the

Digitized by Google

But let us now turn back to Ezekiel and John,—to the Apocalypse of Israel and the Apocalypse of the Church; and let us trace the parallelism to which we have been referring.

Both begin with a description of "the glory;" the one, the symbol, or Shekinah, as it dwelt in the tabernacle and temple above the cherubim, in the Holy of Holies; the other, the reality or antitype, viz., the person of the Lord Jesus, in whom all glory dwells, and from whom all brightness effulges; whose abode is the heaven of heavens, and whose throne is the four living ones, full of eyes before and behind.

Both proceed to speak of apostasy and backsliding, in Israel and in the Church, the prophet specially addressing Jerusalem as the representative of the former; the apostle addressing the seven Churches in Asia as the representatives of the latter.

Both prophesy of the removal of the presence of Jehovah, the visible glory from Israel, the invisible glory from the Church. Ezekiel represents the Shekinah as lingering over the nation, unwilling to depart, first coming out from the holiest, preparing to leave, then hovering over the temple, the city, the Mount of Olives, and then taking wing and quitting the land because of its over-flowing iniquities. John shews us the Head of the Church, grieved with declension in love and duty among his chosen ones; warning, yet sparing; smiting, yet not destroying; as if unwilling to give them up, till he is compelled at last to spue them out of his mouth.

Both go on to speak of the remnant of sealed ones, the one in Jerusalem, the other "out of every kindred and tongue and people." Ezekiel's message is, "Go through the midst of the city, through the midst of Jerusalem, and set a mark upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and that cry for all the abominations that be done in the midst thereof." (Ezek. ix. 4.) John's message is, "Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads." (Rev. vii. 3.)

Both receive from God a roll which they are commanded

spiritualizers in prophecy, who might well be called theological idealists. The sensational is engrossed with the material side, overlooking the other. Nothing is gained by taking either extreme. The truth lies in the right combination of both; for man and the world he lives in exhibit both the spiritual and the material. All truth, like light, is compound. In general it is *dualistic*, like man, possessed of a soul and a body. The parallelisms, not only of Scripture but of the universe, declare this. All that God has spoken and done teaches this.

Digitized by Google

to eat, that, eating thereof, they may renew their prophecies. "Son of man, eat this roll, and go speak unto the house of Israel. . . . Son of man, cause thy belly to eat and fill thy bowels with this roll that I give thee; then did I eat it and it was in my mouth as honey for sweetness." (Ezek. iii. 1—3.) This was the command laid on Ezekiel. That given to John was like unto it. "Go take the little book . . . take it and eat it up, and it shall make thy belly bitter, but it shall be in thy mouth sweet as honey." (Rev. x. 9.) Thereafter, Ezekiel is sent to prophesy to *Israel*, John to "many peoples, and nations, and tongues, and things."

Both predict the different adversaries of God, and of his people, with their character, rise, doings, and destruction; Tyre, Egypt, Babylon, in the one case; the Beast, the False Prophet, Babylon the Great, in the other. In the description of Tyre by the prophet, we have such an inventory of its riches as the following;—"Tarshish was thy merchant by reason of the multitude of all kinds of riches, with silver, iron, tin, and lead, they traded in thy fairs, . . . they traded the persons of men (*Sept.* ψυχαις ανθρωπων), and vessels of brass in thy market, . . . they brought thee for a present, horns of ivory and ebony, . . . they occupied in thy fairs with emeralds, purple and broidered work and fine linen, and coral and agate, . . . bright iron, cassia, and calamus were in thy market, . . . they occupied in thy fairs, with all spices, and with all precious stones, and gold." In the description of Babylon the Great, by the apostle, we have a similar inventory, "the merchandize of gold and silver and precious stones, and of pearls and fine linen, and purple, and silk and scarlet, and all thyine wood, and all manner vessels of ivory, and all manner vessels of most precious wood, and of brass and iron, and marble, and cinnamon, and odours, and ointments, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves, and souls of men." (*ψυχας ανθρωπων.*)

Both set forth at large the apostasy they describe, under the name of adultery; the one the harlotry of the Jewish, the other, that of the Gentile Church. Ezekiel, at great length, and during the course of several chapters depicts the Jewish apostacy in language most vivid, and under figures most terrific, shewing the unutterable loathing entertained by God of their transgressions. (Ezek. xvi., xxiii., &c.) John takes up the same strain, and under the same figure, depicts the guilt of the great Gentile apostacy—Babylon the

Digitized by Google

Great. The parallelism of the images in this case is very striking.

Both introduce the utterances, both of sorrow and of joy, over the downfall of these mighty confederacies,—sorrow by their companions,—joy by the people of the Lord. Thus the friends of the fallen oppressor mourn;—"Then all the princes of the sea shall come down from their thrones, and lay away their robes, and put off their broidered garments: they shall clothe themselves with trembling; they shall sit upon the ground, and shall tremble at every moment, and be astonished at thee: they shall take up a lamentation for thee, and say to thee, How art thou destroyed, that wast inhabited of sea-faring men, the renowned city." (Ezek. xxvi. 16, 17.) Thus the kindred and partners of Babylon the Great lament for her; "The kings of the earth who have committed fornication and lived deliciously with her, shall bewail her, and lament for her, when they shall see the smoke of her burning; standing afar off for the fear of her torment, saying, Alas, alas that great city Babylon, that mighty city! for in one hour is thy judgment come. . . . They cast dust upon their heads and cried, weeping and wailing, saying, Alas, alas that great city, wherein were made rich all that had ships in the sea by reason of her costliness! for in one hour is she made desolate." (Rev. xviii. 10—19.) . . . .

Both speak of a resurrection,—the one in reference to Israel, the other, in reference to the Church. (Ezek. xxxvii. and Rev. xx.) How far these are literal, we do not at present say. Let them be figures, or let them be literalities, still the parallelism is strikingly preserved.

Both point to a particular adversary called, Gog and Magog, whose gathering, assault, and doom, are all described; though it is evident, that the Gog of Ezekiel rises at the commencement of the millennium, and that of John at its close. Yet *fire* is that by which both are destroyed. God by Ezekiel, says, "I will send a fire on Magog" (Ezek. xxxix. 6); and by John, he says, "Fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them." (Rev. xx. 9.)

Both describe a great feast provided for the feathered fowl, and for the beasts of the field,—a feast upon the slaughtered enemies of Jehovah;—a feast which exhibits the doom and downfall of these enemies in the most terrific aspect;—a feast which forms a strange contrast to the "feast of fat things," spread for Israel in that day, (Isaiah xxv. 6,) and still more so, to the marriage supper of the Lamb,

Digitized by Google

prepared for the Bride, the Lamb's wife, in the day of her glorious triumph.

Both predict a city,—the one the earthly Jerusalem, the other the new Jerusalem, that cometh down out of heaven from God. All earthly beauty belongs to the one; all heavenly glory to the other. But here there is a difference. Ezekiel at great length describes a temple—a temple yet to be erected for Israel in their land. John tells us that in the new city there is no temple, for none is needed; just as there is no sun, for none is needed.

Both wind up their predictions in similar strains—the one referring to the removal of the curse from Judea, the other to the entire renovation of the whole earth, and the refulgence of that celestial glory with which God is to invest creation above and below, making all things new. In both we read of the clear refreshing stream which in that day shall pour forth its waters, and of the trees with their healing leaves, which shall then spring up for the nations.

Both books were given for warning as well as for guidance. That which God gave to Israel in her latter days for her recovery from backsliding and counsel in troublous perplexity, she slighted. She refused the warning, she went on in her backsliding, she completed her apostacy, and she was driven to darkness. Our fear may well be lest *we* should despise the book which God has written for *us;* and despising it, hurry on in our rebellious unbelief, reject our mercy, complete a far deeper and more fatal apostacy, and finally be cast into outer darkness, the blackness of darkness, for ever.

Besides these broader and more general features of resemblance between the two Apocalypse there are others more minute, which it is well to notice. They are not only interesting, but tend to cast light the one upon the other. We present them in parallel columns that the similarity may be better observed. We do not arrange them in any special order, but set them down as they occur.

Ezekiel.	John.
1. It was in the fifth day of the month that Ezekiel had the revelation. (i. 1.)	1. It was on the Lord's-day that John had it. "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's-day."* (i. 10.)

* We may notice here how frequently the prophets specify the *time* of their visions as well as the *place*. Let us cite a few instances. Isaiah vi. 1, "In the year that king Uzziah died, I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne." Jerem. xxv. 1, "The word that came to Jeremiah concerning all the people of Judah in the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah." Throughout Jeremiah such references are frequent. But in Ezekiel they are still more so; day as well as year, place as well as time, being specified, just as in the Apocalypse, where

Digitized by Google

EZEKIEL.	JOHN.
2. "I was by the river of Chebar." (i. 1.)	2. "I was in the isle that is called Patmos." (i. 9.)
3. "I was among the captives." (i. 1.)	3. "I, John, who am your brother and companion in tribulation." (i. 9.)
4. "The heavens were opened." (i. 1.)	4. "A door was opened in heaven." (iv. 1.)
5. "Above the firmament was the likeness of a throne." (i. 26.)	5. "A throne was set in heaven." (iv. 2.)
6. "There was a voice from the firmament." (i. 25.)	6. "Out of the throne proceeded lightnings and thunderings and voices." (iv. 5.)
7. "The appearance of the bow that is in the cloud." (i. 28.)	7. "There was a rainbow round about the throne." (iv. 3.)
8. "Their whole body and their backs and their hands and their wings and the wheels were full of eyes round about." (x. 12.)	8. "Four living creatures full of eyes before and behind." (iv. 6.)
9. "The Spirit entered into me." (i. 2.)	9. "I was in the Spirit." (i. 10.)
10. "Fill thine hand with coals of fire from between the cherubim, and scatter them over the city." (x. 2.)	10. "The angel took the censer, and filled it with fire of the altar, and cast it into the earth." (viii. 5.)
11. "Therefore, O Aholibah, I will raise up thy lovers against thee, and they shall come against thee, and they shall deal furiously with thee; they shall take away thy nose and thine ears . . . thy residue shall be devoured by the fire: they shall also strip thee out of thy clothes . . . they shall leave thee naked and bare." (xxiii. 22—29.)	"The ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and shall burn her with fire." (xvii. 16.)
12. "My tabernacle also shall be with them, yea, I will be their God and they shall be my people." (xxxvii. 27.)	12. "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God." (xxi. 3.)
13. "In the visions of God brought he me into the land of Israel, and set me upon a very high mountain, by which was as the frame of a city on the south." (xl. 2.)	13. "And he carried me away in the Spirit to a great and high mountain, and shewed me the great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God." (xxi. 10.)

Patmos is given as the place, and the Lord's-day as the time of the vision. Chap. i. 1, "It came to pass in the thirtieth year in the fourth month in the fifth day of the month, as I was among the captives by the river of Chebar, that the heavens were opened and I saw visions of God." viii. 1, "It came to pass in the sixth year, in the sixth month, in the fifth day of the month, as I set in mine house," &c. (See also xx. 1; xxiv. 1; xxvi. 1; xxix. 1; xxxi. 1; xxxii. 1; xl. 1; Haggai i. 1; ii. 1; Zech. i. 1; vii. 1.) The mention of the Lord's-day in the Apocalypse corresponds exactly with the reference to days and dates by the Old Testament prophets.

Digitized by Google

EZEKIEL.	JOHN.
14. "By the river upon the bank thereof, on this side and on that side, shall grow all trees for meat, whose leaf shall not fade, neither shall the fruit thereof be consumed: it shall bring forth new fruit according to his months: and the fruit therefore shall be for meat, and the leaf thereof for medicine." (xlvii. 12.)	14. "In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations." (xxii. 2.)
15. "The name of the city shall be, The Lord is there." (xlviii. 35.)	15. The throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it." (xxii. 3.)

Such are some of the singular parallelisms discoverable in these two books. More might be traced, but these will suffice. The reader will pursue the hint thus given, and carry out the different features of the resemblance, a resemblance not simply between two books of Scripture, but between the earthly and the heavenly things; thereby obtaining another illustration of the truth that while Israel has possessed, and will hereafter possess again "the patterns of things in heaven," "the shadow of heavenly things;" it is to the Church of God that these heavenly things belong and shall belong for ever.

Much of the right understanding of Scripture depends upon our keeping the above distinction before us. We shall find in it the clue to many a labyrinth, the solution of many a difficulty. We shall find in it the true answer to the questions which so often puzzle the inquirer, and which post-Millennialists are so much in the habit of putting regarding what they call the degrading mixture of the holy and the unholy, the perfect and the imperfect, which is to be exhibited in the Millennial age. In that age we see the Gentile nations forming or occupying the outer court; the Jewish people occupying or forming the holy place; and the risen saints occupying or forming the Holy of Holies, the presence-chamber of the king. Between the outer court and the holy place there is a distinction, but not a very broad one; but between the holy place and the most holy there is a wide and broad distinction, the one representing the earthly, the other the heavenly things. As in the Holy of Holies dwelt the cherubim (the figures of the Church) and over them the glory, so in the heavenly places shall dwell the Church, and over them the true glory, the Incarnate Word, occupying them as his throne. In these heavenly places, which are connected with the earthly as was the cloud that rested over Israel (forming God's pavilion) with the tabernacle itself, shall the Church abide

Digitized by Google

with Christ, *on* the earth as truly as was the pillar-cloud, yet not *of* the earth; going forth from that heavenly pavilion—that palace of the king—that new Jerusalem, which contains within itself the realities of which the Jerusalem below contains but the shadows, to execute their office of regal priesthood over a renewed earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, even as angels have hitherto been executing their present office of obedient service, ministering to them who shall be heirs of salvation.

Art. III.—SHILOH—THE KING OF ZION.

The promise of a Saviour made to our first parents immediately after the fall, gave no more particular intimation regarding him, than that he was to be of the seed of the woman. This very general description of his lineage was gradually made more specific as it was successively revealed to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, that the Messiah should arise from among their posterity. Each of the twelve sons of the latter patriarch became ancestor of one of the twelve tribes of Israel; and in the blessing which the aged saint, under the impulse of the prophetic spirit, bestowed on them before his death, he clearly intimated to which of them the honour should belong of giving birth to the Saviour. Reuben, to whom the privileges of the first-born belonged, had lost them by his own misconduct (1 Chron. v. 1), and they were transferred to Joseph and to Judah,—the double portion to the former, and the pre-eminence to the latter. Thus, two of the twelve portions into which the land of Canaan was divided, fell to the lot of Joseph, namely, the territories of Ephraim and of Manasseh. At the time of their settlement, Ephraim appeared to have altogether the advantage over Judah. In numbers, indeed, it somewhat fell behind; but then Shechem, the metropolis of the land, and Shiloh, where the tabernacle was set up, were both of them within the borders of that tribe, while the resort of the people to the latter three times a-year at the solemn feasts, could not fail to increase its importance. In looking over the list of the Judges, we observe that the majority of them dwelt in Shechem, or its neighbourhood. It would, indeed, seem, that the Almighty gave to Joseph's

Digitized by Google

descendants an opportunity of assuming the leading place among the tribes, and only removed it in consequence of their apostacy, consummated when the ark of God was presumptuously carried into the field of battle, and fell into the hands of the Philistines. It never returned again to its dwelling-place in Shiloh. (Jer. vii. 12; 1 Sam. iv. vii.) How beautifully does the Psalmist narrate this portion of history. "They provoked him to anger with their high places, and moved him to jealousy with their graven images. When God heard this, he was wroth, and greatly abhorred Israel: so that he forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh, the tent which he placed among men; and delivered his strength into captivity, and his glory into the enemy's hand. . . . . Moreover he refused the tabernacle of Joseph, and chose not the tribe of Ephraim: But chose the tribe of Judah, the Mount Zion which he loved. And he built his sanctuary like high palaces, like the earth which he hath established for ever. He chose also David his servant, and took him from the sheepfolds: from following the ewes great with young he brought him to feed Jacob his people, and Israel his inheritance." (Psalm lxxviii. 59—61, 67—71.)

The jealousy between the tribes of Ephraim and of Judah, of which we can trace several intimations in the earlier history of the nation, came to a crisis in the reign of Rehoboam, David's grandson, when the state was divided into two rival kingdoms. But before this, the promise implied in Israel's prophetic blessing had begun to be fulfilled. Judah had acquired the pre-eminence. David, who belonged to that tribe, had been anointed king, and had reigned seven years and a half at Hebron. He then took Jerusalem out of the hands of the Jebusites, and made it his royal city, building his palace upon Mount Zion, and bringing up the ark from Kirjath-jearim, where it had remained ever since the Philistines had restored it to Israel. (2 Sam. v. vi.)

We now return to the prediction of the dying patriarch. The first portion of it announced the future superiority of the tribe of Judah. "Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise: thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow down before thee. Judah is a lion's whelp: from the prey, my son, thou art gone up: he stooped down, he couched as a lion, and as an old lion, who shall rouse him up?" But it is to the next verse that we would particularly direct attention. "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the

Digitized by Google

people be." *Shiloh* is of course the Messiah. So all the ancient Jewish commentators have understood the passage, however they may have differed as to the precise signification of the term. The meaning of the word is, probably, "the peace-giver," and it is, therefore, an appropriate title of him who is called the "Prince of Peace" (Isaiah ix. 6), and at whose birth the angels sang, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill towards men." The promise then is, that till the coming of Christ, the sceptre should not depart from Judah; and the interpretation commonly given of the prediction is, that at the time of the birth of Christ the sceptre was not departed, but was in the hands of Herod, and after him of Archelaus, but that at the close of the nine years reign of the latter, Judea was reduced to be a Roman province, and so the sceptre departed.

This interpretation, however, will scarcely bear a close examination. For in the first place, if by the sceptre be meant *royal* authority exercised in the kingdom of Judah, as distinguished from that of Israel, then there was no sceptre in Judah at the time of the delivery of the prophecy, nor for 530 years afterwards, until David was raised to the throne; whereas the expression, "the sceptre shall not depart," implies that the sceptre was there when the patriarch spoke. Besides, it must be admitted, that during the Babylonish captivity, and for some time after, there was no royal authority whatever in Judah. And, moreover, if the Asmonean princes be regarded as bearing the sceptre of Judah, we must surely admit that it had departed when Archelaus had to plead for his crown against Herod Antipas before a Roman subject. Or, in the second place, if the sceptre mean the authority exercised by the *prince* of the *tribe* of Judah, how can the rule of Herod and his successors at all answer to this view, seeing that he was an Idumean or Edomite, and had no connexion with the tribe of Judah, or even with the nation of Israel at all.

We are persuaded that the real meaning of the prediction is somewhat different from that commonly attributed to it, and that the accomplishment of it is far more striking than is generally perceived. The figurative language employed may be thus translated:—"*The succession of princes or governors of the tribe of Judah shall continue uninterrupted until it terminate in the person of the Messiah.*" The word שבט (*Shebet*), translated in our version *sceptre*, means a *rod* or *staff* of any kind, and more particularly that rod or staff which was the symbol of patriarchal authority, and was borne

Digitized by Google

by the head man of each tribe. Hence it comes to be used even to signify a *tribe*, or the body united together under this rod of sovereignty. Thus in Gen. xlix. 16, 28, "Dan shall judge his people as one of the shebets (tribes) of Israel." "These are all the shebets (tribes) of Israel, twelve." We read of these rods in Num. xvii., where each one of the princes, that is, each of the heads of the tribes, is commanded to bring to Moses a rod, on which the name of each was to be written. It must not be supposed, however, that this was the first institution of the symbol, for the patriarchal staff had been from the very earliest times the emblem of authority. In the second clause of the prediction the term "lawgiver" is used as parallel with the staff of the former clause. If then the *staff* denote the authority belonging to the head of a tribe, the *lawgiver* must be the *head* or *prince*, by whom this authority is exercised. And by this term it would have been more clearly rendered.

The peculiar expression, "a prince shall not fail *from between his feet*," means, according to the Hebrew idiom, from among his lineal descendants. It has indeed been suggested, that as an aged person leaning on a staff would naturally place the end of it between his feet, so the meaning of the whole passage is, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the staff from between his feet." The word, however, in the original does not mean *staff*, and the phrase, *from between the feet*, is too common in Hebrew to permit us to apply it to anything else than the succession of son to father. This idea of succession is one that we cannot afford to drop out of the text, seeing that it has met with a remarkable and exact fulfilment, to which we shall now direct our attention.

In Num. i. we have an account of a numbering of the children of Israel, which took place in the second year after the people came out of the land of Egypt; and there are twelve men named there as "princes of the tribes of their fathers, heads of thousands in Israel." Among these, NAHSHON, son of Amminadab, was prince of the tribe of Judah, and of course was entitled to bear the sceptre or staff of authority. (Num. i. 4, 7, 16; vii. 12.) His descent from Judah is given in the book of Ruth, in 1 Chronicles, and in the Gospel according to Matthew, and consists of the following steps:—JUDAH, Pharez, Hezron, Ram, Amminadab, NAHSHON. The son of Nahshon was Salmon, or Salma, and he must have been prince of Judah at the time of the division of the lands under Joshua. We find indeed, in the record of that event (Jos. xiv.), that the most prominent individual of

Digitized by Google

the tribe of Judah is the warrior Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, who was one of the spies who were sent to search out the land, and was a contemporary of Nashhon, the father of Salmon. But this does not invalidate the claims of *Salma*, for he was in some sense the son of this very Caleb, while in another respect he was the son of Nashhon. Both genealogies are given in 1 Chron. ii. The one stands thus, Hezron, Ram, Amminadab, Nahshon, SALMA (v. 9—11). The other thus, Hezron, Caleb, who by one of his wives, named Ephratah, had Hur, the father of Caleb, the father of SALMA. (v. 50, 51.) The two Salmas are one and the same individual; for the first is described as the father, or rather the ancestor of Boaz, the *Bethlehemite*, while the second is called the father of *Bethlehem*, that is of all the families that settled in and inhabited that city. This double paternity is of frequent occurrence in Hebrew genealogies. We have another example of it in the case of Caleb himself, who is generally called the son of Jephunneh, the Kenezite, but who, as appears from the genealogy just quoted, was also the son of Hur. We may perhaps suppose that Salma, the son of Caleb, married the daughter and sole heiress of Nahshon, and was thus reckoned his son. In this case, so long as Caleb lived, his son was not likely to assume the public authority of the princedom acquired by his marriage, which accounts for his not being mentioned in the narrative which records the exploits of Caleb. Salma then was the representative of two out of three of the great families which sprung from Hezron, the grandson of Judah.

The next name in the genealogy is Boaz, and it confirms our remarks to observe that while the book of Ruth and the Gospel of Matthew alike trace him up to Judah, through *Nahshon*, the story makes it plain that he must have been a descendant of Caleb. For he was a near kinsman of Elimelech, the husband of Naomi, who was an Ephrathite, that is, a descendant of Ephratah, the wife of the first Caleb. From Boaz we trace the succession, through Obed and Jesse, to David. It seems probable that Boaz, Obed, and Jesse, would be recognised in the times in which they lived, as the successive representatives of the head of the tribe of Judah, and would receive a patriarchal reverence from their contemporaries, although they might not be required, in virtue of the honour of their descent, to take any *prominent part in public affairs*. David, however, the son of Jesse, was the youngest of eight brethren, and although descended from the princes of Judah, he owed his elevation

Digitized by Google

to the special favour of God, who appointed him to bear rule among his brethren, just as he had chosen Judah instead of Reuben, or Nahshon instead of one of the elder branches of the family of Judah.

From the time of David another promise began to be fulfilled. The Messiah was to be of his seed. This promise, however, was coincident with the other. For David, being in the direct line of the princes of Judah, and raised by God to sit upon the throne, he who is entitled to wield David's sceptre is entitled also to bear the staff of the tribe of Judah. We trace the succession through an uninterrupted line of monarchs, from David to Jeconiah, and the Evangelist Matthew has recorded the genealogy. (Matt. i.) At this point, however, there is an apparent difficulty. It is said concerning Jeconiah, "Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days, for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David and ruling any more in Judah." (Jer. xxii. 30.) But in Matt. i. 12, and 1 Chron. iii. 17, Salathiel is mentioned as his son. The difficulty is only apparent. Jeremiah does not assert that he should be *absolutely* childless, but only that he should be entered in the registers as childless, having no son born to him while he was King who might have sat afterwards upon his throne. For Salathiel was born at Babylon, and in captivity, a fact to which some have thought that the compiler of the book of Chronicles alludes, and that when he says, "The sons of Jeconiah, Assir, Salathiel, his son," the word *Assir* should have been translated, and the whole rendered thus, "The sons of Jeconiah the captive, Salathiel, his son." The son of Salathiel was Zerrubbabel, who was prince or governor at the return from the captivity, so that from Judah to David, and from David to Zerubbabel, there was never wanting one to bear the sceptre of the tribe. Nor can we omit to observe that Judah was the only one of the tribes that had at this time preserved its sceptre. Benjamin had long been incorporated with it, and the ten tribes were lost in captivity. But there was still a Prince of Judah, the descendant of its ancient kings.

If, however, the succession of rulers was to terminate in the Messiah, it is not enough to show that he was a descendant of Judah and of David; we must also establish, if possible, that after him none other could arise to make a similar claim to sit on David's throne. For this purpose, before we carry on the descent from Zerubbabel to Christ, we shall return to examine the collateral branches of the family

Digitized by Google

of Judah. It is apparent that the selection of David by God himself, at once shuts out all the collateral branches then existing of the family of Judah. For example, none could claim the honour by tracing his pedigree up to one of David's brethren. Then, as to David's own posterity, we have a list of his sons given in 2 Sam. v., and 1 Chron. iii. In the former of these passages, they are divided into those born at Hebron, and those born *after David was king in Jerusalem.* In the latter, four of those born in Jerusalem are distinguished as having been sons of Bathsheba. Now, by a rule of succession, common in the East, none of the sons born before he reigned in Jerusalem, could claim to succeed him in the whole kingdom; and it would appear also, that those born of other wives taken after his marriage to Bathsheba, were also excluded. At least, David promised that one of Bathsheba's sons should succeed him. They were four in number, Shammuah, Shobab, Nathan, and Solomon. Shammuah died in infancy. (2 Sam. xii. 18.) So also, probably, did Shobab, as we read nothing more of him: and thus the sons of Bathsheba are reduced to two, Nathan and Solomon. It is most remarkable, that while Zerubbabel was the direct representative of the line of Solomon, he was also the representative of the line of Nathan. Matthew gives us the descent from the one, and Luke from the other. According to Matthew, Zerubbabel was the son of Salathiel, the son of Jeconiah. According to Luke, he was the son of Salathiel, the son of Neri, whose pedigree is traced up to Nathan. Here we have a case exactly resembling that of *Salma.* Salathiel was the son of Jeconiah, and also the son of Neri. Perhaps he married the daughter and only child of Neri, and so became the representative of the family of Nathan, in consequence of which, Zerubbabel united in himself the blood, privileges, and rights of the *whole* family of David.

Different collateral branches of the royal family must have sprung up from time to time, of which no record has been preserved by the sacred historians. But in the providence of God, the main stem was preserved distinct, and without any neighbour near the throne, by the murder of "all the seed royal" by Athaliah, and by the miserable fate of the whole family of Josiah. This monarch had four sons, Jehoram, Jehoiakim or Eliakim, Zedekiah or Mattaniah, and Shallum or Jehoahaz. (1 Chron. iii. 15; 2 Kings xxiii. 34, xxiv. 17; Jer. xxii. 11; 2 Kings xxiii. 30.) Of Jehoram we read nothing, so that probably he died young. Shallum, or

Digitized by Google

Jehoahaz, succeeded his father, reigned three months, was carried into Egypt, and died there without children, so far as we know. Jehoiakim then ascended the throne, and had two sons, Jeconiah or Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah. This Zedekiah, however, appears from other passages to be the same person who is mentioned as son of Josiah. Jeconiah was carried into captivity childless, and Zedekiah who succeeded him (whether his brother or uncle), was put to death with all his children by the King of Babylon. Thus Jeconiah was the sole surviving member of the family. He was only eighteen years old, and childless, when carried into captivity, in which he remained for thirty-seven years before Evil-merodach released him from prison (Jer. lii. 31); so that the accomplishment of the promise hung at this time upon a very frail and slender thread. We may apply to the birth of Jeconiah's son, in this respect, the language used by the prophet concerning the Messiah, "There shall come forth a rod from the stem of Jesse, and a branch (or shoot) shall grow out of his roots" (Isaiah xi. 1); that is, a young shoot shall spring from the stump of the tree which is cut down. Indeed, there can be little doubt that it was to this event that Ezekiel referred, when in the twenty-seventh year of Jeconiah's captivity, he prophesied, "In that day I will cause the horn of the house of Israel to bud." (Ezek. xxix. 21.) On the same occasion, Psalm cxxxii. appears to have been written, "There will I make the horn of David to bud: I have ordained a lamp for mine anointed" (ver. 17), in which last words there seems to be an allusion to Neri, whose daughter we have supposed that Salathiel married; for the word "lamp" is in the original נר (ner), while Neri, if translated, signifies "my lamp," and Neriah (which in all probability was his Hebrew name), "the lamp of God."

The remaining part of the succession from Zerubbabel to Christ, need not detain us long. We have it in the genealogies of Matthew and Luke, and as these evangelists trace it through two different sons of Zerubbabel, Abiud and Rhesa, it would appear that in Christ, the blood and privileges of the whole family of Zerubbabel were united, exactly in the same manner that the privileges of the whole house of David descended to Zerubbabel. All the intermediate individuals were uncrowned heads, but, nevertheless, the line of those who might claim to bear the sceptre of Judah remained uninterrupted. Christ was the individual entitled to sit on David's throne, in virtue of his descent from David. He must have been king, had there been a king of David's line,

Digitized by Google

and after him there never could be another, who could rightfully claim that dignity.

In regard, however, to the genealogies given by the evangelists, it is necessary to remark, that while both of them *appear* to give the descent of *Joseph* from Zerubbabel, it seems clear that Luke intends to supply the pedigree of *Mary*. The last three names which he furnishes, are Matthat, Heli, and Joseph. The Jewish writers always call Mary, the daughter of Heli; so that we may conclude, that Luke means to call Joseph the son of Heli, only because he married Mary, Heli's only child. The genealogy given by Matthew, seems to be that of Joseph, proving him to have been a descendant of David, and accounting therefore for his having gone up to Bethlehem to be taxed. And, besides, according to the Jewish method of keeping their genealogies, Jesus would be entered as son of Joseph, his reputed father, and heir of all his privileges. As the Gospel history speaks of certain *brethren* of Jesus, it becomes necessary to say a word or two respecting them, in order to show that none of them or their descendants could have been the representative of David's line, in the manner that Christ was. Their names were James, Joses, Simon, and Judas. (Matt. xiii. 55.) The first of them appears to have been an apostle. (Gal. i. 19.) But there were only two apostles of that name, the son of Zebedee, and the son of Alpheus. From Mark xv. 40, compared with John xix. 25, we find that the mother of James the Less, was the sister of the Virgin Mary, and wife of Clopas. In this case, Alphæus and Clopas must be the same person; and, in fact, they are only different renderings into Greek of the same Hebrew name חלפי.* The result of an investigation into this subject, with the details of which it is not necessary to trouble our readers is, that Alphæus, or Clopas (a different person and name from Cleopas)* was probably the brother of Joseph, and that Mary his wife is called the sister of the Virgin, only because she was the wife of her husband's brother. By a use of language common in the Bible, her children are termed the brethren of Jesus, while they were only his reputed cousins; and, in point of fact, were no relations to him at all. As, therefore, the mother of Christ was the last of the eldest branch of David's family, that branch expired in Christ, and the dignity could be taken up by no other.

* See Winer's Realworterbuch; Articles, Alphæus, Kleopas, Klopas. Clopas is an Aramaic, but Cleopas, a Greek name; the latter being a contraction of Cleopatros.

Digitized by Google

There are still some particulars connected with the temporary removal of the crown from the line of David which demand our attention. At the close of the reign of Jeconiah, the last *in order of descent* who sat on David's throne, the prophet Jeremiah was instructed to utter the following denunciation. "As I live, saith the Lord, though Coniah the son of Jehoiakim king of Judah were the *signet* upon my right hand, yet would I pluck thee thence. . . . . O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord. Thus saith the Lord, Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days: for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah." (Jer. xxii. 24, 29, 30.) A few years afterwards, when Zedekiah had ascended the throne, the same prophet was commanded to publish a word of comfort to assure his people that his promise should not fail. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah. In those days, and at that time, will I cause the *Branch* of righteousness to grow up unto David (dead and ready to perish though the stock may seem); and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely; and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. For thus saith the Lord; *David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel.*" (Jer. xxxiii. 14—17.) And again, at the close of the reign of the same Zedekiah, the last who actually sat upon the throne of David, Ezekiel utters a fearful denunciation, "And thou, profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, in the time of iniquity, even in the end, Thus saith the Lord God; *Remove the diadem* (or priestly mitre המצנפת), *and take off the crown* עטרה; this shall not be the same (or continue): exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him." (Ezek. xxi. 25—27.) The second of these passages conclusively proves the correctness of the view we have taken of the bearing of the promise. Even during the time when no man sat upon the throne of David there was never wanting one, according to that promise, who had the right to do so, until Shiloh came. But we have placed these texts together in order that we may point out certain obvious references to them in the predictions of subsequent prophets. When Zerubbabel, the

Digitized by Google

descendant of David, and governor of Judah, was engaged in building the temple after the return from the captivity, Haggai and Zechariah were appointed to encourage him in his work. We find Jehovah saying unto the first of these prophets, "Speak to Zerubbabel, governor of Judah, saying, I will shake the heavens and the earth; And I will *overthrow* the throne of kingdoms. . . . . In that day, saith the Lord of hosts, I will take thee, O Zerubbabel, my servant, and will make thee *as a signet:* for I have chosen thee, saith the Lord of hosts." (Hag. ii. 21—23.) And, again, Zechariah is commanded to say to Joshua, the high priest, the fellow-labourer of Zerubbabel, "Hear now, O Joshua the high priest, thou, and thy fellows that sit before thee: for they are men of sign: for, behold, I will bring forth my servant *the Branch.*" (Zech. iii. 8.) He is also told to "take silver and gold, and make crowns עטרות, and set them upon the head of Joshua; and speak unto him, saying, Behold the man whose name is *The Branch;* and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord: and he shall bear the glory, and shall *sit and rule upon his throne*, and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." (Zech. vi. 11—13.) Zerubbabel and Joshua were both of them typical of Christ; the one in his kingdom, the other in his priestly office. At the destruction of the temple, the line of kings and of priests, had, both of them, been interrupted by the violent death of Zedekiah, and of Seraiah, the chief priest. Thus the *mitre* (for this seems to be the meaning of the word מצנפת) had been removed, and the crown taken off. In the third chapter of Zechariah, Joshua, the high priest, received again the mitre, צניף, from the angel of the Lord, a symbolical act which is immediately followed by the prophecy we have just quoted of the bringing forth of God's servant, the Branch. In the sixth chapter, the *crown* (עטרה) is restored, and the restoration is followed immediately by a prediction exactly similar. But it is not restored to Zerubbabel, as we might have expected, but to Joshua, God thereby testifying that the kingdom and the priesthood were, in the days of his servant, the Branch, to be united in one person. The root of David had now budded, and a *branch* had sprung out. The likeness, at least, of David's kingly *crown*, taken from Zedekiah, was restored for a little to the prince of the captivity. The throne had been *overturned*, but a faint image of it was established, though only for a season. The *signet*, cast from the Lord's hand in the rejection of Jeconiah,

Digitized by Google

was resumed in the acceptance of Zerubbabel. The fair promise, however, passed away; the gleam of hope was again ominously overclouded; yet, not for ever. He should come, whose right it was, and after the shaking of nations and the overthrowing of kingdoms, should sit as a priest upon his throne.

When Christ *did* come, we find many intimations in the Gospel history that he was indeed Israel's king, not merely in a spiritual sense, but literally, and really, in right of his descent from David. The title had long lain dormant; the registers of the lineage of David's family had probably been little consulted; but the decree of Cæsar, the consequent journey of Mary to Bethlehem, and the birth of Jesus there, could scarcely fail to bring to light the fact, that the new-born child was, indeed, the heir to David's throne. Indeed, this fact seems to have been so well known, that we do not read that his claim to be the son of David, was ever once challenged. Hence the trouble of Herod, when he heard that one was born, "King of the Jews." And, perhaps, it was for the very purpose of giving a public testimony to his royalty, that the star-led Magi were brought from the East to adore him. Christ, himself, also, when arraigned before Pilate, distinctly claimed to be the King of the Jews; although he admitted that his kingdom was not of this world, and that he had no intention of dispossessing the strangers who had seized his inheritance. What might have been the consequences, had the Jews accepted him, we need not inquire, for the counsels of Divine wisdom had otherwise determined. It was necessary that the rejection of him should be public and unequivocal. "Shall I crucify your King?" said Pilate. "Yes," replied the Jews, "we have no king but Cæsar." Memorable words! the Son of David is cast out, and a Gentile invited to occupy his throne. The Messiah was cut off, the inscription on his cross bearing a closing testimony to the fact, that he was the "King of the Jews." The sceptre departed. Was it for ever?—Let us turn again to the prophecy.

When Shiloh came, he was not only to be the person entitled to bear the sceptre of the tribe of Judah, but it is also predicted concerning him, that unto him should the "*gathering of the peoples* עמים *be.*" Between the fulfilment of these two predictions, there lies a long interval. The *peoples* who are to be gathered, are the believing Gentiles, as well as the Jews. "It is a light thing," saith Jehovah to the Messiah, "that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the

Digitized by Google

tribes of Jacob, and restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the ends of the earth." (Isaiah xlix. 6.) Christ himself alludes to the interval we speak of, "Ye shall not see me, henceforth," he says, "till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." He has come, the king of Israel; he was rejected, but his claim he withdrew not. He ascended into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God, until he should make his enemies his footstool; and send the rod of his strength out of Zion. (Ps. cx. 1, 2.) The same Psalm tells us that his "people shall be willing in the day of his power." Between his first coming and his second, there shall be a great contrast. *Then* he was rejected as a deceiver; hereafter, he shall be welcomed, as he who cometh in the name of the Lord. "Unto him shall the gathering of the peoples be."

There are some persons who believe in a future restoration of the Jews to their own land, where they shall dwell under the rule of a prince of their own nation, but who deny that this king will be the Lord Jesus Christ. Prophecy, however, is clear upon this point, that if there be any future king of the Jews, he must be a son of David. And it would be well to consider, whether it is possible consistently to hold a restoration of the Jews, and to deny that Christ shall reign over them. We think the belief of the first point must, necessarily, include the other. For where can now any son of David be found who could lay claim to that throne which Christ has already challenged as his own? None but himself can possibly sit on it. He it is for whom it is reserved, the Shiloh, unto whom "the gathering of the people shall be."

We can only touch upon the remainder of this remarkable prophecy. It relates to the Messiah more than even it does to Judah. We have the authority of the Holy Spirit for believing that the Lion of the tribe of Judah is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. (Rev. v. 5.) And the work which he undertakes when he is revealed as the lion, is the work of judgment upon his enemies. This is apparent from the following passages, which our space will not permit us to quote at length. (Isaiah xxxi. 4; Jer. l. 44; Hos. xi. 10, xiii. 7, 8; Rev. v. 5, x. 3.) It is parallel with the shaking of the earth and the heavens, and the overturning the thrones of kingdoms, in the midst of which, the *desire of nations shall come*. (Hag. ii. 6, 7, 21, 22.) And how significant in this view is the closing prediction regarding

Digitized by Google

Shiloh, "Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass's colt unto the choice vine; he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes. His eyes shall be red with wine, and his teeth white with milk." A traditionary remembrance of this ancient prophecy seems to have suggested to the impure minds of the Heathen, the fancy of their God, Silenus, whose very name appears to be a corruption of Shiloh: but its mysterious intimations announce to those who are familiar with the later Scriptures an era of vengeance, and yet of peace. The mention of the foal and the ass's colt, reminds us of Zechariah's prophecy, "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass." (Zech. ix. 9.) The washing of his garments in wine carries us forward to the day of Bozrah, when the Redeemer shall appear with his garments dyed in blood, treading the winepress of his wrath, because the day of vengeance is in his heart, and the year of his redeemed is come. (Isa. lxiii. 1, 4; Rev. xiv. 19, 20, xix. 16.) While the rest of his redeemed ones in his kingdom, is also significantly pourtrayed. They shall drink abundantly of what he has prepared for them, "wine and milk without money and without price." (Isa. lv. 1.)

Art. IV.—THE VIEWS OF AMERICAN WRITERS ON PROPHECY.

The American press has, of late, been more fruitful than formerly, in works on prophecy, and a zeal has been displayed in the circulation of these works, well worthy of the imitation of British Christians. As regards the character of their writings in a literary point of view, the depth of knowledge, and clearness of statement displayed in them, they are, generally speaking, much inferior to the works of that class which have been published in England. There is a hastiness apparent in their compositions, especially in the matter of dates, not befitting a subject so intricate, and sometimes an apparent want of that seriousness and deep solemnity which the subject calls for. But the object of this paper is not to examine the style of these compositions, or to institute comparisons, but to

Digitized by Google

bring to the test of Scripture, the leading principle which pervades them.

Most, if not all the American writers on prophecy, maintain the Pre-millennial advent of Christ; but they hold respecting it, what many in this country did during the last century; viz., that the Millennial kingdom will be composed entirely of Christ and the risen saints, who will inhabit the earth in its renewed state for 1,000 years. Many of these English divines were believers in a previous *spiritual* reign also, by which they meant the universal triumph of truth in the earth, at which time they also believed that the Jews would be restored to their own land, and become a praise in the earth. The American writers hold that the coming of Christ is near at hand, and may be expected daily; that when He comes the earth will be completely destroyed, and afterwards gloriously renovated, in order to form a dwelling-place for Christ and his saints, who will then be raised from the dead. This view excludes two things, which most students of prophecy on this side the Atlantic stedfastly believe,—1. The restoration of the Jews to their own land, and the spiritual and national glory to which they shall be raised. 2. The conversion of all nations to Christ. If there are to be no men living in the flesh on earth after the coming of Christ, of course neither of these things can be fulfilled. Against both these points the writers referred to steadily contend. They consider that all the promises referring to the Jews, have either been fulfilled in their past history, or that they must be applied to the spiritual seed of Abraham. On the latter point they lay great stress, and vindicate the method of applying the Scriptures, on the ground *that the Old Testament is ruled by the New;* or, in other words, that such texts, as "if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise," as well as the manner in which certain passages, such as Isaiah liv. 1, and Jeremiah xxxi. 31—34, are applied in the New Testament, furnish them with a precedent for such an interpretation.

This course of argument assumes two things,—1. That the New Testament does *not* recognise the distinct nationality and future glory of the Jews;—and 2. That it does not predict a period when God shall be served and loved universally by men living in the flesh. Both these positions are mere assumptions. The converse of both is the truth.

The New Testament *does* clearly recognise the nationality of the Jews, and as clearly intimate that as a nation they shall again become the acknowledged and covenant people

Digitized by Google

of God, in agreement with the many prophecies contained in their ancient records. Dr. M'Caul, in a tract, entitled, "New Testament Evidence of the Conversion and Restoration of the Jews," has clearly proved the following points:—1. That the New Testament preserves the distinctive appellations of "Israel" and "Gentiles," in their Old Testament sense. (Matt. x. 5, 6; Acts ix. 15; Rom. xi. 25; Gal. ii. 12—15.)* 2. That the New Testament asserts the perpetuity of the Jewish national privileges. (Rom. iii. 1—3; ix. 4; xi. 1—29.) 3. It expounds literally certain passages of the prophets, the literal interpretation of which necessarily implies the literal restoration of the Jewish people; Rom. xi. 26, 27, (which is quoted from Isa. lix., and stands connected with Isa. lx., Rom. xv. 10—12.) 4. The New Testament itself contains original passages leading to the same conclusion. (Luke i. 70—74; i. 32, 33; Matt. xix. 28; Acts ii. 30; iii. 21.) The argument founded on Rom. xi. considered in connexion with the 59th and 60th chapters of Isaiah, is most conclusive. The apostle distinguishes clearly between "the remnant according to the election of grace" among the Jews, who, together with "the called from the Gentiles," were the spiritual seed of Abraham; and the nation of Israel, the "all Israel," who shall in a future day be saved. It may be objected by some, besides the American writers, that while the apostle positively asserts that the Jews will be converted to the faith of Christ, he says nothing concerning the restoration to their own land, the reply shall be given in the words of a proposition clearly laid

* "The following peculiarity of the prophetic language ought diligently to be attended to in interpreting the prophecies:—In the writings of the prophets, *Israel* and the *converted Gentiles* are never confounded together under the common patronymic of the former, but are carefully distinguished from each other, the names of *Jacob*, *Israel*, or *Judah* being applied to the one, together with the title of God's people (עם) in the singular number, while the general appellatives of *Gentiles* (גוים), *peoples*, (עמי), and *nations*, or *families* (אמים), invariably in the plural number are used to distinguish the nations of the world, whether in a *converted* or *unconverted* state. (See Isa. ii., xi., xlix. 6, lxi. 9; Ps. vi. 7; Jer. xxxiii. 9.) This single peculiarity of the prophetic language demolishes at once the spiritualizing system of interpretation followed by the American brethren, which rests upon this principle, namely, that in the glorious state of Messiah's kingdom, all national distinction between Jew and Gentile is to be entirely and finally abrogated. But if, as we have seen, appellatives implying national distinction are applied to both branches of Christ's family (i. e., to both Jews and Gentiles), even during the glorious dispensation of the age to come, then the continued existence of a distinct national polity of Israel, and by consequence, the certainty of their national and literal restoration, must be admitted."—*Voice of Israel.* No. 1.

Digitized by Google

down and ably proved by a recent writer:—"The PEOPLE and the LAND of Israel are so connected in numerous prophecies of the Old Testament, that whatever LITERALITY and PERPETUITY are ascribed to the one, must on all strict principles of interpretation be attributed to the other also."* This proposition is demonstrated by Gen. xvii. 3—8; Lev. xxvi. 40—45; Deut. xxxii. 43; Isa. xi. 11—16; Isa. xix. 23—25: Jer. xxiii. 5—8; Ezek. xxxvii. 21—28; Ps. lxxxv. 1, 2; Jer. xv. 19, 20; Zech. iii. 9, 10. All these, and many other passages, mention the *people* and the *land* in connexion, and thus prove beyond all doubt, that if ever Israel as a nation are again taken into covenant with God, it will be in their own land. The concluding words of the Song of Moses are most remarkable. After having traced in rapid outline Israel's history; exhibited God's gracious dealings; his people's rebellion; their long and fearful captivity in consequence thereof; the calling of the Gentiles in their room, and the apostasy of "the foolish people," he concludes with a description of the fiery judgments which God will pour down upon apostate nations, and his rich mercy toward Israel,—"he will render vengeance to his enemies, and will be merciful to his LAND and to his PEOPLE." (Deut. xxxii. 43.)

The New Testament also asserts that the Saviour's kingdom shall include men dwelling in the flesh as well as glorified saints, and that this kingdom shall be universal. Neither Christ nor his apostles anywhere teach the opinion now so commonly held, that universality is a characteristic of the present age or dispensation. The parables of the Lord, and the teachings of the apostles, all lead us to conclude with Simeon, "that God did visit the Gentiles TO TAKE OUT OF THEM a people for his name." In other words, the feature of this age is election or selection, not universality. (Acts xv. 14.) But after this people have been gathered, and the bride, the Lamb's wife, is completed, then "when the seventh trumpet shall sound, when the dead shall be judged and God's servants rewarded," then shall "the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ." (Rev. xi. 15—18.) Then will the Lord return and build up the tabernacle of David which is fallen down, that the residue of men might seek after the Lord. (Acts xv. 14—17.) And even after the new Jerusalem shall be revealed in all its glory, there will be dwellers on earth distinct from the inhabitants of that celestial city. "The nations of them

* "Lowe's Edinburgh Magazine," for Dec., 1847.

Digitized by Google

which are saved shall walk in the light of it, and the kings of the earth do bring all their glory and honour into it." (Rev. xxi. 24; Rev. xxii. 2.) Then shall be the "times of restitution of all which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts iii. 21.) And time would fail to quote the places in the prophets which declare that "*men* shall be blessed in Christ, and that *all nations* shall call him blessed" (Psalm lxxii. 15), all concurring with Daniel, that when the Son of man comes in the clouds of heaven there will be "given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him." (Dan. vii. 14, 27.)

It is quite true that the subjects of Jewish restoration and the universality of Christ's kingdom among men are alluded to in the New Testament more sparingly, although largely dwelt upon in the Old. There is a sufficient reason for this to be found in the character and design of the New Testament revelation. Each dispensation of God has its appropriate object and design. The Gospel dispensation is not one of external glory nor universal extent. Its design is to accomplish the purposes of sovereign and electing love in the salvation of a chosen people, and thus prepare a royal priesthood to minister and rule in the universal and everlasting kingdom. God intended to reveal by it what was not known before, but he never intended to set aside or neutralize any of his previous communications. Christ came not to "destroy the law or the *prophets*, but to fulfil."

Having shewn that the leading principle of our American brethren is *baseless*, and that the New Testament plainly denies what they maintain it affirms, let some of the defects and evil consequences of their system be considered.

I. *It is inconsistent with itself.* Certain passages of unfulfilled prophecy are literally interpreted, and others have a figurative meaning affixed to them. What authority can any expositor have to affix a literal meaning to Rev. xx. 1—6, and a figurative one to Zech. xiv.? If the announcements of the Saviour's Advent and the resurrection of the saints are to have a literal meaning, why should not the declarations that "Christ will reign over the house of Jacob for ever" (Luke i. 32), and "that the kingdoms of this world should be his kingdom" (Rev. xi.) be literal also? Such a system wants coherence and consistency. Its own main principle helps to slay it.

II. In the manner in which the Jewish question is treated, and the texts which refer to their restoration are disposed of,

Digitized by Google

there seems *a great want of sympathy with God*. All God's book was written by Jews. The greater part of it belongs to them *now*. (Rom. ix. 1—4.) But this system of interpretation robs them of nearly all. It gives them the threatenings and takes from them the promises. It says that God *has* forgotten them—that he will remember them no more—that he has cast them off and broken his covenant with them, and says this in the face of the following passages, and many more of similar import:—Isaiah xlix. 16, 17; Jer. xxxiii. 19—26; Hosea xi. 8, 9; Rom. xi. 1, 2. Thus it declares that sin has triumphed over love, and rebellion conquered mercy; and that the name of the Lord God of Israel is an obsolete title of the Most High, although he declared that it is "his memorial for ever." Thus God's providence in preserving them distinct for so many ages goes for nothing; there is no purpose of mercy toward Israel! Against such perversions of God's truth we lift up his own glorious words, "And yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break my covenant with them: for I am the Lord their God. But I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt in the sight of the heathen that I might be their God: I am the Lord." (Lev. xxvi. 41, 45.) Read in connexion with this ancient prediction the closing words of Micah's prophecy (vii. 15—20), and it must be evident to every unprejudiced mind that the things here spoken of are yet future—that they shall certainly be fulfilled—that they lie very near the heart of God—and that great glory shall come to him from their accomplishment.

III. *A great part of God's Word seems burdensome rather than helpful to the system objected to.* There cannot be a surer proof of the faultiness of the system than this. If persons can get on better with a few texts than with the whole Bible, doubtless they have adopted a partial view of truth, and most probably have added some error thereto. It is painful to see how some persons labour to get rid of the obvious meaning of Scripture. If the Bible means what it says, their own sense tells them that their system must be at fault, and then the Bible is put upon the rack to extort from it some other meaning. This rage for reconciling, this unwillingness to take God's Word in its plain literal meaning, and to take it *all* as *his* word, whether it agrees with our system or not, has been productive of much evil in every department of

Digitized by Google

Scripture study. In reading many of the expositions of prophecy given by those who deny the restoration of the Jews and Christ's universal kingdom, how unnatural and forced do they appear. All are made to bend to a theory, and for this end they are crushed and mutilated and shorn of their beauty.

IV. Another evil is, *that a method of interpretation is introduced which, if applied generally, would undermine every truth of Scripture.* If all the prophecies relating to the Jews may be got rid of by adopting a certain principle, might not other Scripture truths be disposed of in a similar way? What truth is safe if God's words, if plain texts of Scripture, are made to bow to a fancied principle of human reason? In this way some arrive at the conclusion that God nowhere in his Word invites sinners to receive salvation. In vain we point them to numerous texts of Scripture: they have weighed these in the balances of system; and we are calmly told that God does not mean what he seems to say in the plainest manner. Others going still farther from truth declare that the Bible contains no testimony to the Godhead of Christ. They, too, have a system which requires them to misunderstand the Scriptures. This truth-destroying practice is found in the system of prophecy now opposed. We do not charge its advocates with dishonesty or heresy. Most of them, we suppose, are sound in the leading truths of Christianity; but in some of the American books on prophecy which we have seen, there were matters of doubtful disputation, and others of a dangerous tendency, concerning the resurrection of the body, the immortality of the soul, and the eternity of future punishment, which would seem to indicate unsoundness to a considerable extent. All the above-mentioned subjects may certainly be explained away by a method of interpretation similar to that adopted with reference to prophecy.

V. The last point which we mention is, that by this system *redemption seems to be shorn of many of its glories.* It secures, it is true, the salvation of an elect Church, but there it stops. It provides the *rulers*, but leaves them without *subjects* over whom to reign. If in a few years the human race as at present constituted are to become extinct, Satan will most assuredly have had the vast majority for his prey. But we have brighter, better hopes for man. We believe that God's original purpose will yet be wrought out, and that even after Millennial times the earth will be filled with a holy population over whom Christ and his saints shall reign. "For the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom and possess

Digitized by Google

the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever." (Dan. vii. 18.) Man's unbelief and misinterpretations shall not make the faithfulness of God without effect. His dispensations shall run their majestic round, exhibiting man's utter nothingness, and unfolding the glories of the eternal name. God's designs shall be all accomplished, his desires all fulfilled, and heaven and earth shall be full of the majesty of his glory.

Art. V.—THE DIFFICULTIES OF EXTREME FUTURISM.

In any crisis or day of perplexity men betake themselves to the counsel of some one whose shrewd wisdom and superior foresight may be a guide to them in struggling through the gloom. Desponding under the failure of manifold attempts to open up a way for themselves, they welcome any promise of guidance or counsel from one whose ampler knowledge warrants their confidence. In brighter days he might be slighted or only consulted by a few studious or curious minds; now he becomes a trusted oracle; nay, perhaps, a nation gathers round his wisdom and asks his pilotage.

That crisis has now overtaken the world. That day of perplexity has now fallen down upon the Church.

Happily for her, there is a counsellor—one who not only makes himself accessible at all times, but has put into her hands a book of counsel to which she may refer. That counsellor is the Holy Spirit;—that book is the sure word of prophecy, and specially, as the summing up of that sure word, the Apocalypse of the Lord Jesus Christ. For light in the last season of darkness; for pilotage in the last storm, there is no book like this.

For such a time was this book given, and in such an hour is it prized and consulted. It is the day of evil that sends men to the study of it, alike for light and consolation. Once, when skies were sunny, it might be undervalued; now, it is a friend born for adversity. In all times of pressure and perplexity, the Apocalypse has been studied with an eagerness and care such as had not before been bestowed on it. And hence, in our own day, it is thus earnestly consulted. Hundreds (might we not write thousands?) are betaking themselves to the study of it. It is beginning to be looked upon as specially the counsellor of the Church in the last days of evil, as specially the light in the

Digitized by Google

dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star arise. In it the Church feels sure that she will find light and guidance; by it she feels that she will be prepared to meet her enemies in their threatening onslaught; from it she is persuaded that she will be enabled to re-kindle, and feed the flame of her dimly-burning lamp until the bridegroom come.

Hence the eager and increasing study of this book in these last days. The search which is now making into it is greater than has ever been. Everywhere men are digging into this mine, and though hitherto there have been many failures, yet the pursuit is continued with unabated fervour and resolution. Men are endeavouring to view it on every side, going round and round it that nothing may escape their eye. They are taking up each separate symbol, and examining them with an avidity and precision such as has not been hitherto attempted. Every question relating to it is sifted and scrutinized; and though there may be on one hand over-hastiness, and on the other over-caution; on the one hand the stale repetition of exploded systems and comments, and on the other, the reckless extravagance that riots in what is bold and new; yet, notwithstanding these extremes, many fragments of abiding truth are coming up to the surface, and many worn-out errors are gradually passing into obsoletism and oblivion.

We feel considerable anxiety with reference to the extremes just noticed. Both of them are evil and must generate error. We know so little of some parts of the Apocalypse as yet, and are beset so hardly with jostling systems, that to stereotype our present amount of apocalyptic knowledge would be folly. On the other hand, there is so much that is *unproved*, speculative, and extravagant in the other direction, as to make us tremble at the haste which some interpreters are making to shake off every fragment of what is old in the hot pursuit of what is strange and new and wild. Let us not shrink from truth however new; but let us not cast it away, however old. We must glean it in every field, but let us be careful that what we do glean is really truth—truth which rests itself distinctly upon the Word of God, not upon the conjectures of man.

Those of our readers that have been looking into the works written upon the Revelation, within the last years, will be at no loss to understand our meaning; and, in some degree, we trust, to sympathize with our anxiety. They will not charge us with exaggerated statements, or, at least, they will bear with us in saying that we are alarmed at the rash excesses of speculation which are given way to by some, who seem *in haste* to interpret the prophetic word, forgetting

Digitized by Google

that in this, as in every other thing, "he that believeth doth not make haste."

Without dealing with details at all, we are led to advert to one or two general points connected with Apocalyptic exposition, which seem to us to be, in part, at least, the hinges upon which Apocalyptic exposition must turn. To some readers they may seem unimportant; to those who have studied the subject, they will appear of no inconsiderable moment.

I. The Apocalypse relates not to the Jew, but to the Gentile; or, at least, to the Church of God, the gathered ones out of every nation. Some recent expositors will have it to be essentially and thoroughly Jewish,—relating to a Jewish remnant yet to be called. We ask, what proof is there, from the word, for this exclusive application? The allusions throughout are to Gentiles, not to Jews; and John, at the commencement, dedicates the book to Gentile Churches. "John to the seven Churches which are in Asia, grace be unto you and peace." This dedication is *before the vision begins*, and, therefore, cannot refer to some future Church, but to seven existing Gentile Churches in Asia Minor. The dedication is, in style and form, precisely the same as those which we find at the commencement of Paul's Epistles, as, for instance, in the beginning of the Epistle to the Ephesians we read, "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, to the saints which are at Ephesus, grace be to you and peace." The names of the Churches are all Gentile names; nay, the name of one of the martyrs is Gentile also, viz., Antipas.

Further on, the same Gentile and universal aspect of the book is presented to us in several places. Thus the new song sung by the redeemed, runs in the name of every nation, "Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." Then, again, in the seventh chapter it is written, "I beheld and lo, a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes and palms in their hands." Besides these, there are other allusions throughout, which shew us that the Apocalypse is a book for the Church, not for the Jew, nor for any remnant of Jews at all. The Jew is lost sight of during the present dispensation, save as an outcast, or as gathered in among the Gentiles, a mere atom in the mass of the Church.

It is of importance to advert to this, because some insist upon giving to the Apocalypse a Jewish aspect. They thus,

Digitized by Google

in effect, deny that the natural branches are broken off, and that it is the wild olive-tree that is now bearing fruit. They remove the Church from that place of prominence and honour to which God has exalted her, and they raise the outcast Jew to his elevation before the time appointed. In more senses than one, the present are "the times of the Gentiles," and during these times the Jew is hidden. He is not the subject of prophecy (save as an outcast) till these times are concluded. And as the Apocalypse relates to the latter part of the times of the Gentiles, we naturally conclude that its references are Gentile, not Jewish.

We confess that we do not very well understand the desire of some to give the Apocalypse this Jewish colouring. It is done upon such exceedingly slender evidence, or, rather, upon no evidence at all. It is done upon mere hints and allusions, which, because of a Jewish nature, are supposed to demonstrate that the scenes are all strictly Jewish. One might as well reason that the Epistles of Paul to the various Gentile Churches were Jewish, because they contain so many Jewish figures and allusions. There is no direct proof that the Apocalypse is a book for the Jews. There is direct evidence of the opposite. If so, then the tendency of the Jewish theory (as we may call it) must be to darken the book, not to shed light upon it; to lead us entirely away from the true interpretation, instead of conducting us to it.

II. The promises and blessings mentioned in the Apocalypse relate not to what is earthly, but to what is heavenly. In Isaiah and Ezekiel there is frequent reference to coming blessings, but they are *earthly*. They refer to that lower condition of things which Scripture designates by that name. In the conclusion of the 65th chapter of Isaiah we have specimens of the earthly blessings; "There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days: and they shall build houses and inhabit them, and they shall plant vineyards and eat the fruit of them," &c. In the concluding chapters of Ezekiel we have similar examples of earthly blessings, which our readers will at once discover by a reference to the passages. Very much, if not nearly all of these Old Testament prophecies refer to what is earthly—to the subordinate glory—to the inferior blessing. But in the Apocalypse it is widely different. There the promises refer almost exclusively to what is called "heavenly;" not as if they had no connexion at all with earth in any sense, but as being higher and more glorious in their nature. The promises to the seven Churches of Asia are specimens of

Digitized by Google

what we mean; as, for instance, in chap. ii. 7, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God." Or, again, in the concluding chapters of the book, we have a full spreading out of the heavenly blessings in reserve for the Church. The parallelism between these chapters and the closing ones of Ezekiel is very remarkable. It is a parallelism which brings out and establishes the difference between the two series of blessings, the earthly and the heavenly—Ezekiel giving us a sketch of the earthly, John of the heavenly.

Here it is that some of our modern *extremists* introduce such confusion. They confound the *earthlies* of the Old Testament with the *heavenlies* of the new. They utterly destroy the parallelism of these two prophetic lines, which throughout Scripture are kept so steadily distinct and unmixed. We can hardly conceive it possible for any one keeping his eye carefully on the above parallelism to rush into such singular interpretations of the Apocalypse as we have read. Yet they not only cling to the new theory, but use the language of superiority towards those who will not follow them. It is sad that there should be such an attitude assumed by one saint towards another, and more especially so when the hastiness with which some modern views have been adopted cannot but expose them to suspicion, even had the proof adduced been tenfold stronger than it is. How great the difference between the disciple and the master! The master knows all things, yet takes no attitude of superiority towards the most ignorant and froward. The disciple knows but little, yet cannot tolerate dissent on the part of a fellow-disciple from some points to which he himself but yesterday attained.

III. A large portion of the Apocalypse must have its fulfilment *before* the second coming of the Lord. This is denied by some in our day. They maintain that the Apocalypse only begins to be fulfilled when the Lord comes. Every thing written in this book is said to be fulfilled in what they call "the day of the Lord," the day which commences when the Lord comes to raise his saints.

Now it is remarkable that many of the promises and warnings throughout the book are of his coming. To the Church of Ephesus he says, "Repent, or else I will come unto thee quickly." To the Church of Pergamos he says the same. To Thyatira he says, "Hold fast till I come." To Philadelphia he says, "Behold I come quickly." Under the *sixth* seal, but not till then, is it said,

Digitized by Google

"The great day of his wrath is come." Then, under the sixth vial, his coming is spoken of as still future,—"Behold, I come as a thief: blessed is he that watcheth." Then three times over in the 22d chapter it is said, "Behold I come quickly."

In these passages it is evident that "the coming" referred to is the very same as that coming for which the Lord instructed his saints to wait—to which the apostles directed the eye of the saints—for which the Church has all along been waiting. If it be a different coming that the Apocalypse speaks of, there is certainly something inexplicable in the language used. It will require decided proof to shew that the Advent spoken of in the Apocalypse is a different Advent, at a different time, and for different purposes than the Advent referred to in the Epistles. Yet no one of the future ultra-futurist expositors has set himself to demonstrate this point. They take it for granted; and, moreover, they seem disposed to decline the proof on the ground that those who ask for it must be mere tyros in prophetical study.

We feel somewhat disposed to enlarge upon some of these points, and to add to them one or two more bearing in the same direction. But, in the meantime, we shall leave the subject here. If there be any truth in these suggestions, then the position of the *extreme* futurists must be untenable. *How much* of Apocalyptic fulfilment is future, and *how much* is past is a right and lawful question. But that not one word of it has been fulfilled as yet, and that the whole, from the first to the twenty-second chapter, is to be fulfilled in "the day of the Lord," that is, *after the Lord has come, and caught up his saints*, is a position which the whole tenour of the book (no less than its special details) seems to forbid as unlawful and impossible.

Article VI.—PROOFS OF PRE-MILLENNIALISM FROM THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LAST DAYS.

The Apostle John thus writes, "Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time." (1 John ii. 18.) He thus points out a certain period, regarding which he affirms certain things, both as to its limits and its nature. We propose to inquire

Digitized by Google

into these, both for the end of obtaining what information the Holy Spirit has been pleased to give us respecting them, and also of discovering how far, and in what way they bear upon the question of the pre-millennial advent of the Lord.

Three points specially call for consideration, as arising out of the statement of the apostle in the passage before us. I. What is the beginning of this period? II. What is its ending? III. What are its features or characteristics?

I. *What is the beginning of the period here called the last time?* In this inquiry we have not to do with precise dates, either of days or years, which might admit of dispute; but with a larger yet quite definite and specific age, regarding which no question can be raised. Speaking with exactness we should say that the last time began with the first coming of the Lord. For thus the apostle writes, "Hath in *these last days* spoken unto us by his Son." (Heb. i. 2.) And Peter, in like manner says, "Was manifest in *these last times* for you." (1 Peter i. 20.)

But whether this be conceded or not, it will be admitted that these "last days," or this "last time," had begun when John wrote this Epistle, for he says expressly, "It is the last time," or literally, "the last hour (now) is." We are in no wise begging the question, or any part of it, when we affirm that whatever be the precise date for the commencement of this period, still by the time when John wrote this Epistle (A.D. 90), it had really begun. The words of our passage are too distinct to admit of any other meaning,—"Little children, it is the last time." This period then is not one which can be thrown backward into a past age, whose circle had revolved ere the Son of God had come. Nor is it a period which can be thrown forward into a future age,—an age future either to the apostle or to us. Its *commencement* at least is a thing already past. We are assured that this cycle, or era of the world's history, has really set in, and that nearly 1800 years ago. We are not in the position of men who know that there is such a period as the last time, but are left in uncertainty whether that time be far off or nigh, whether our feet have crossed the threshold,—left to wonder and to doubt as to its nearness or its distance,—left to conjecture or to calculate when we may be entering its awful gloom. We are clearly assured that the time has been commenced, that the threshold has been overstepped, that the era has been fully entered on,—nay, that 1800 years of that period have already run their course.

Apart then from every other consideration, of date and

Digitized by Google

circumstance, how arresting, how over-awing, the thought that we have entered upon the shadows of a period, which we cannot help suspecting must, from its very name, be big with infinite issues for this world of ours! How solemnizing, how thrilling the utterance, "It is the last time," more especially when we are assured that eighteen centuries of its cycle have already come and gone. And with what a resistless argument are the ministers of Christ furnished when dealing with the ungodly, and enforcing their message of peace as ambassadors for Christ!

"Men of the earth (they can say), will you not make haste to accept the proffered friendship of him in whose favour is life, lest in a moment his wrath be kindled and ye perish from the way? Will you still linger and slumber on the spot where fiery vengeance so soon shall burst, instead of betaking yourselves this very hour to the shadow of the sheltering cross;—the one ark, the one Zoar, the one Pella, that you may be hidden in the day of the Lord's fierce anger, from the woes long since pronounced against the world, but now upon their way to the fulfilment of their mission,—woes, not the transient blaze of sudden anger, but heavy-laden with the righteous, deliberate, though long-deferred vengeance of 6000 years."

II. We inquire, *What is the ending of the period here called the last time?* Its ending is the second coming of the Lord.

This is rendered very obvious from the third chapter of second Peter. There the two things are referred to, viz., the last days and the Lord's coming. During these last days, and specially as they are running out, scoffers arise, and their scoffing is evidently directed against that event, which many were expecting, and which was to bring to an end that age or dispensation in which they were mocking. It is plain that there had gone forth a rumour through the world,—a rumour which had reached the ears of these scoffers, to the effect that the day of the Lord was approaching. This had been a rumour of long standing, the non-fulfilment of which for many a day, had given cause to the profane taunt of these Atheists. The delay of the long-predicted day had opened their lips and made their voices grow louder in scorn. The longer the delay, the louder rose the taunt. The longer the delay, the wider stretched the sweep of wickedness, exulting in the falsity of the Divine Word, as proved and demonstrated by the non-arrival of the great day, or any tokens that could indicate even the likelihood of such an event.

Yet, says the apostle, let them mock as they will at its non-arrival, let them reason out from the world's past and

Digitized by Google

present history the impossibility of its arrival, that very day will come! Long-expected, long-deferred, long-scoffed at, it will come at last! Their infidelity will then stand appalled, when they find their reasonings disgraced, their taunts so awfully silenced, their boastings put to shame! "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night."

We do not see it possible to avoid the conclusion that the mockers of the last days, and if so, the days in which they mock, run on to the Advent and there terminate. We can hardly conceive of one reading that chapter through without coming to this conclusion. The case stands thus. The apostle predicts that mockers should arise. He tells us that the period during which they were to continue mocking was the "last days." He shows us also that the special event at which these mockings of theirs were to be cast was to be the coming of the Lord. "Where is the promise of his coming? What has become of the promised Advent? There are no signs of its arrival. Is it all a lie, a threat, a boast, a fable?" Then he declares that the very event, in the non-arrival of which they were exulting, and respecting which they were taunting the saints as being deluded, disappointed men, would burst down upon them with unexpected haste and stealth, like a thief in the night. Is it not obvious from all this that the last days were to continue their course up till the time when the Lord arrives? It is not possible to maintain, in the face of these words, that the last days were to terminate a thousand years before the conflagration,—nor is it possible to wedge in a whole millennium of righteous blessedness between the days of the mocking and the day of the Advent.

This view is confirmed by a reference to the Epistle of Jude, wherein the same events are treated of, and the same dark scene spread out to view. His whole Epistle is occupied with a description of the mockers, the apostates, who were to walk after their own ungodly lusts, and who are manifestly the same as those described by Peter. In the midst of this description he makes reference to their end and doom, as to be accomplished by the coming of the Lord,—the literal and personal coming of the Lord. "Enoch, also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all the hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." From this it seems to follow, as a thing of course, that these mockers,

Digitized by Google

who were already, in the apostle's days beginning their mockery, were to go on mocking, age after age, till the Lord should come to execute judgment upon them, and that these last days, which had in like manner commenced in the first age, were to continue till the Advent of the Lord. No one surely can say, that from such a passage we might, after all, infer that the last days, and the mockery which was to mark them, would terminate a thousand years before the Advent. No one would think of interposing a thousand years' blessedness and righteousness, between the last days and the Advent, between the mockers and the Advent. May we not, on the contrary, conclude, upon no uncertain ground, that the Advent must of necessity *precede* the Millennium, else the statement of this passage must be regarded as contradictory or inexplicable?

Our position is farther confirmed by the Apostle Paul's statements in his Second Epistle to Timothy. There we read (iii. 1), "in the last days perilous times shall come, for men shall be lovers of their ownselves, covetous, boasters, proud, &c." Then he goes on to state several things connected with this overflowing wickedness; concluding (at ver. 13) with the sad announcement, that these "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." And then, after pointing Timothy to the inspired Word of God, as that which would enable the children of God to meet the ungodliness of these days, he adds, "I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." (iv. 1); as if pointing forward to that appearing as the great event by which all this wickedness of these last days was to be ended, and to that kingdom as the glorious exchange which this earth was then to make,—an exchange of holiness for unholiness, of reality for form, of obedience for lawlessness, of rest for restlessness, of harmony and oneness for discord and division and fragments without number or end. We might advert here to the peculiarity of expression, "appearing and kingdom," not "kingdom and appearing," as showing, beyond question, that the appearing is before the kingdom; but we content ourselves with simply drawing the general inference, that the last days which the apostle is describing are to terminate in the coming of the Lord.

Such then is the ending of the last days, or last time. And what an ending,—an ending which adds immeasurably to the solemnity of a period, in itself so solemn and ominous! The

Digitized by Google

ending is as marvellous as was the beginning; no less broadly marked and standing apart in isolated, but towering grandeur. It is not like some African river, disappearing in the barren sand; nor like Jordan, losing itself in a sea of death; nor like some European stream, spreading calmly out until it widens into its kindred ocean, bearing upon its well-pleased bosom the vessels of an hundred ports; but like some long-winding river, across whose mouth, just ere it reaches the ocean, there shoots a precipice, forming a cataract of stupendous height, over which its dark waters rush in one headlong mass, carrying over along with them the freightage of a world; till with the noise of the infinite plunge, and the burst of wild terror from the descending multitudes, the echoes of the wide earth are awakened, and a sound arises to heaven such as never has been heard before beneath these skies, nor shall be heard again for ever! This period of the last days began with the Advent of Messiah as Saviour, it is to end with his Advent as Judge and King. It began with the voices of the heavenly host in Bethlehem; it is to end with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God. It began with the incarnation of the eternal Son, it ends with his enthronization. It began with his subjection to a sub-angelic state of suffering, servitude, and shame; it ends with his exaltation here on earth to a super-angelic elevation of glory, majesty, and power. Fit ending for such a beginning! Fit consummation for so marvellous an introduction! Fit sunset for so radiant yet so portentous a dawn!

It is this ending that is awaiting us! Are we then living like those who have behind them such a beginning, and before them such an ending,—a beginning so fraught with glad tidings of great joy to all,—an ending so bright with glory to the saint, so dark with shame and ruin to the sinner? Do we feel what it is to be placed between two such infinite and awful certainties? And as we descend the river and are assured, by having now, in these days of ours, entered upon the rapids which precede the cataract, that the crisis is at hand, are we making ready for that event in which all so soon shall end? Have we made thoroughly sure of our heritage of glory, our portion in the promised kingdom, so that whether dying soon or living till the Lord appear, we shall welcome the voice of the archangel that is to summon us up into the pavilion-cloud in which our Lord shall come and into which he shall receive his risen saints, that there they may abide in safety from the storm of fiery vengeance which shall then lay waste the earth?

Digitized by Google

III. We inquire, *What are the features or characteristics of this period,* which thus begins with the first and ends with the second coming of the Lord?

The words of the apostle, quoted at the commencement, are very explicit upon this point. They say, "As ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now are there many Antichrists, whereby we know that it is the last time." From this we learn that the features of this last time are to be *not Christian but Antichristian.* The prevalence of Antichrists and of Antichristianity is to be the special note whereby men shall know that it is the last time. There may be other marks, other signs, other features; but this is the main, the prominent one,—that which absorbs and overshadows all the rest so completely, that in comparison with it they may be set aside and overlooked. So prominent, so certain shall this characteristic be, that if any one ask you, "How am I to know this last time, by what marks shall I distinguish it from all preceding and from all succeeding times," you can answer unhesitatingly, "You may know it by the prevalence of Antichrists; not by the conversion of the world, but by its waxing worse and worse; not by a whole millennium of blessedness irradiating the close of its day, but by the existence of mockery, ungodliness, and Atheism." These are the apostolic marks or characteristics of the last time. If these be awanting you cannot be sure that it is the last time; nay, you may be absolutely certain that it is not so. If, therefore, I find in any prophetic scheme or system, a holy millennium preceding the advent,—a millennium, without scoffing, without Atheism, without ungodliness,—a millennium during which the knowledge of the Lord is covering the earth as the waters cover the sea,—then I am entitled at once to say that system is untrue and unscriptural,—for it introduces a characteristic of the last days which Scripture does not, nay, which is absolutely incompatible with that which Scripture affirms to be the true and proper characteristic, whereby that period may be infallibly known. If such a system were correct, the passage before us would require to run, "Little children, it is the last time, and as ye have heard that a millennial age of blessedness should come, even now do we see the earnest of it in so many turning to the Lord, whereby we know that it is the last time." And that passage also in Second Peter, which we have already referred to, respecting the scoffers and their doom, would require a similar alteration, running in some such way as the following:

Digitized by Google

"There shall come mockers in the last days, saying, Where is the promise of his coming? and after these mockers have been converted, their mocking silenced, and earth made blessed for a thousand years, then the day of the Lord will come, but not as a thief in the night, for by these thousand years you shall be put upon your guard and enabled to know the day and hour when your Lord shall come, so that there will be no need for watching,—no need for watching *before* the commencement of that blessed era, for he is not to come till its close; no need for watching *when it is terminating*, for the time of his arrival will be manifest to all."

The special mark, then, or characteristic of the whole period between the two Advents was to be the prevalence of Antichrists and the elevation of *the* great Antichrist,—the overflowing of wickedness throughout, and the maturity of that wickedness as the end of the age draws on.

This prevalence of Antichrists had commenced in the days of the apostle,—"Even now are there many Antichrists." The *germs* of Antichristian wickedness had been in existence from the beginning, but the peculiar form of evil, called here specially Antichristian, had no proper existence, neither could have any such, before the Advent of Messiah. For there was no actual Messiah for whom a substitute might be set up; no Christ to mock or to mimic; no Christ to deny or blaspheme. But no sooner had Messiah come than this new form of evil began to exhibit itself. Antichrist sprang into being as Antichrist,—that is, as the rival, the substitute, the adversary of Christ. It was not a thing of one form, but of many. One form might predominate and overshadow the rest in this age or that era, but still it was a being or system of many aspects, many shapes, many guises.

The first age saw the first though slender uprising of this "deadly upas, this all-blasting tree;" the second age saw its still further growth; the third beheld it spreading itself out and rising in stature. Each successive age saw this plant of hell, this rival of "the plant of renown," shoot upwards and stretch its branches on every side, watered and watched over by Satan himself, who had planted it in this fallen soil. At length one form of Antichrist decidedly predominated. It outstripped all its fellows, and took the lead in dark maturity of evil. For ages that special form of Antichrist continued to flourish, gathering to itself all various wickedness, and absorbing in itself all lesser forms of evil;

Digitized by Google

thus witnessing to the world all the while that this was the last time, so that any one looking at it might know this of a truth.

Up till this age and hour there has always been this testimony to the world, that it was the last time. No age, no Church, no nation has been allowed to forget it, however much they might seek to thrust it aside or remain uninfluenced by it. No one, in any age or era, looking round upon his nation or his world, could ever congratulate himself that he had outlived that day of evil and passed into a happier age,—an age of gold, like that which gladdened earth ere man had sinned and Paradise was blighted. No one, however hopeful, could say at any time, See the extent of godliness in the earth,—cities, kingdoms, nations, bowing the knee to the Anointed One. For no fair vision, such as this, has yet been seen on earth. And if, at any moment, fancy or fond charity has made some, more hopeful than the rest, throw a colouring over the shadows of earth, till they had well-nigh persuaded themselves that godliness had triumphed; then the sight of that hideous image, that satanic spectre, the mimicry, the mockery of the Incarnate Son,—ANTICHRIST,—in a moment drove to flight all such idle dreamings,—proclaiming, as with the voice of God himself, *It is the last time!*

Look at that image,—that living form of sin covering the whole earth with its shadow, and say, is the last time over—have its gloom and perils gone by? Look at that portrait, that personification, that incarnation of the Evil One, and say, is it not the last time? Is not that the very token given us by God himself, whereby we are to know that it is the last time?

What do we now see around us in this age? Is Antichrist in the dust, and Christ upon the throne of earth? Is Popery levelled and broken? May the whole earth now rejoice at the news of her overthrow? Nay, she is but mustering her forces for the last battle-field, preparing to sound the trumpet for the last onset and shock of war. Or, to change the figure, like the serpent, she has retired for a little out of sight to change her skin and re-appear in new and more attractive guise,—guise which will but the more thoroughly allure and fascinate the carnal eye,—guise not merely fitted to mislead and bewilder and blind, but fitted to charm, to enchant, to enthral. Usurper of the rights and garb of royalty, she has hitherto sat upon the thrones of kings and wielded imperial sceptres. But these are gone, or at least are fast vanishing away. Yet not with these shall her ambition or her power

Digitized by Google

depart. Mistress of all cunning wiles, wielder of the potent spell, she is now throwing herself upon the democracy, winning them with smiles and flatteries, that she may rise to a more daring height and secure for herself a wider sway than heretofore. Popery and Infidelity, superstition and Deism, Jesuitism and Atheism, have coalesced, or are preparing to do so. A *concordat* is set on foot between them, as once there was effected between Napoleon and the Pope. They are openly fraternizing. Their apparently discordant elements will soon commingle as the heat of human passions augments,—passions without rule or law; and as the whirl of wild events waxes fiercer and more rapid—events which God is allowing to take their unhindered way, that it may be seen what a hell man himself can make of a fair world like this,—out of this strange dark fiery mixture the last Antichrist will arise, incorporating into himself every form of wickedness, from that of Cain and Nimrod down to that of Hildebrand and Napoleon; yet at the same time drawing round himself every fashion of external religion that superstition has devised in her most fertile ages. The bigotry of Spain and the Communism of France will unite in brotherhood as owning one paternity. Communism will become Popish and Popery Communistic. Communism and Atheism will become the body-guard and champion, or more properly the battle-axe of Popery, and Popery in loving return will bless its trees of liberty, wreathe the tricolor around the crucifix, and chant the *Te Deum* in honour of some wretched harlot, seated in the temple of nature as the Goddess of Liberty or Reason!

Hitherto Popery has flourished only upon the soil of superstition; the subsoil of Infidelity has repelled her roots and threatened to wither up her whole stem. Now, through Satan's wondrous art, that unkindly subsoil is affording her nourishment and strength. Her roots have pierced it, and through the vitality with which it is pervading her she is sending up new shoots, and stretching forth yet broader, greener branches. She is fast ripening as the last Antichrist,—the darkest concentration of human wickedness, the boldest mimicry of Christ, the truest personification of the Evil One which the world has ever seen! "Rejoice not, whole Palestina," says the prophet, "because the rod of him that smote thee is broken, for out of the serpent's root shall come forth a cockatrice, and his fruit shall be a fiery flying serpent." (Isa. xiv. 29.) So say we to those who are now exulting because they conceive that Popery has received its last stroke, under the deadliness of which it must speedily come to

Digitized by Google

nought. Rejoice not yet, lest your joy be premature,—rejoice not yet as if the rod of him that smote thee were broken for ever; the serpent's root seemed destroyed when Rome Pagan, the persecutor, passed away; but out of that serpent's root came forth the adder; and now the adder may seem crushed, but the fruit of the crushed adder is to be a fiery flying serpent,—a serpent no longer creeping, but winged for wide flight throughout the nations of the earth,—a serpent no longer merely armed with poison, but breathing flame,—flame from that abyss out of which it has arisen, and into which it shall ere long return.

Besides the passages already referred to there are many others that predict the same condition of evil for the world, and tribulation for the Church during this present dispensation. We do not cite Old Testament prophecies, for we admit that there is greater indefiniteness as to periods or age in these. The expression, "last days," for instance, which Jacob used upon his death-bed when making known the destinies of his sons, is indefinite as to time or era. So are other passages which merely mean "hereafter." But we confine ourselves to New Testament predictions, in which the field is necessarily narrowed, and the age becomes consequently more definite and specific.

Let us take up our Lord's own prophecy. It begins with the ruin of Jerusalem, and ends with his second coming. The whole of it is a picture of storm and gloom. It is written all over with lamentation and mourning and woe. The time which it describes is one of evil throughout, a time of sin, a time of calamity, a time of the prevalence of Antichrists. No gleam of sunshine, no interval of calm relieves the heavy scene in any part, still less towards the close of the era there defined. Clouds thicken, and darkness deepens, as the ages roll away. The burden of the chapter might be given in the words of the apostle, "Little children, it is the last time; and as ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now are there many Antichrists, whereby we know that it is the last time." He answers fully and explicitly the questions of his disciples, "What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the age;" yet he says not one word of anything but sorrow and disaster, crowding on each other like billow upon billow, without intermission. He gives many minute and most palpable signs of his coming,—yet they are all dark and fearful,—wars, famines, earthquakes, pestilences, the uprise of false Christs, tribulation, persecution, martyrdom! No turning of the sword into the plough-

Digitized by Google

share, and the spear into the pruning-hook; no days of prosperous gladness for a weary earth, and a harassed Church, as the forerunners of his Advent; not a word respecting a whole Millennium of blessedness before his coming, which would, beyond all question, be the brightest and most vivid sign, a sign which could occur but once, and not, like the others, be repeated,—a sign beyond the possibility of mistake,—a sign, therefore, which could not have been concealed or passed over without misleading the Church, and leaving totally unanswered the very question to which he undertook to reply. Is it conceivable, that he could have failed to mention this as one of the signs, if it were really to occur *before* the Advent? and can there be a more obvious or natural reason assigned for his silence as to this, than that it was to take place *after*, and not before that great day of the Lord? In answering the question, "What shall be the sign of thy coming," could he mention a few years' famine, and yet omit a thousand years of gladsome plenty, when the earth would yield her increase? Could he mention a few months' pestilence, and yet be silent as to the thousand years' removal of all blight and curse? Could he mention the momentary earthquake, and yet take no note of a whole Millennium of calm and peace? Could he speak of the sorrow, and yet be silent as to the joy, especially when that joy was to be such, as that all former sorrow should not once come into mind? Besides, how could these evils—the famine, the pestilence, the earthquake, the tribulation—be signs of his coming, if they were all to pass utterly away and be forgotten, for a thousand years before he arrived? They might be set down as simple historical events; but *signs*, *forerunners*, they could not be. Thus, according to the Lord's own words, the period or era, from the day he uttered the prediction concerning it, up to his second coming, was to be a period of evil, not of good, of darkness, not of light throughout.

This argument as to the uninterrupted evil of the last times, founded upon our Lord's prophecy, derives both illustration and force from a peculiar statement in it, which is mentioned by Luke alone. "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." (Luke xxi. 24.) And then it is added, "then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory." (Ver. 27.) From this we learn, that one special characteristic of the present age, was to be the treading down of Jerusalem, during the times of the Gentiles, and that this treading down of Jerusalem, and these times of the Gentiles,

Digitized by Google

were to be terminated by the coming of the Son of man in glory. Gentile sovereignty and tyranny, as symbolized by the fourth beast, or Roman empire, were to continue until the coming of the Lord; but how could this be, if that beast was to be destroyed, and that tyranny to end a thousand years before the Advent? Jewish degradation and dispersion, the down-treading of Jerusalem,—such as we see at this day, were to continue, until brought to an end by the Lord's coming,—as it is elsewhere written, "The Redeemer shall come to Zion, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." But how could this be, if that degradation and scattering were to end, and be exchanged for glory and restoration, a thousand years before that Redeemer came?

This argument is confirmed, by reference to the fourteenth chapter of Zechariah, where the future and final siege of Jerusalem is described at large. This siege, with all its accompanying horrors, described in the first two verses, is the last stroke of judgment upon Israel, the last drop in the vials of wrath. For ages, these inflictions have been descending upon them,—but that is the last. For ages, their Gentile enemies have been persecuting and assailing them; but that is the last act of oppression which they are permitted to perpetrate. How then is this last Gentile assault to be met and overthrown? By the Lord himself, at his coming, with all his saints; as it is written, "Then shall the Lord fight against these nations, as when he fought in the day of battle; and his feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east; and the Mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, ... AND THE LORD MY GOD SHALL COME, AND ALL THE SAINTS WITH THEE." Is not this a direct commentary upon the passage we have been adverting to, "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled; and then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory?" If the desolation of Jerusalem, and the calamities of the people at the hand of their Gentile oppressors, are only to be ended by the coming of the Lord, with all his saints,—by his descending upon that very Olivet from which he ascended,—then how is it possible that a whole Millennium of rest to Israel and holiness to the earth can intervene between the day of their suffering and the day of the Lord's appearing? It is expressly declared that he will come with all his saints to destroy their Gentile down-treaders, to deliver them from the long yoke under which

Digitized by Google

they have been bending; and is not the inference from this most obvious, that it is not till *after* he has come that Israel has rest, and Jerusalem becomes Jehovah-Shammah,—Salem, the city of peace, the seat of the true Solomon—the true Melchizedec, under whose blessed sway she will lift her head once more among the nations, and become the centre and fountain-head of blessing to a renewed and holy earth? It would assuredly require strong proof, and proof of the most direct and positive kind, to lead us, in the face of all this, to conclude that there really was an intervening period of a thousand years, or, as many maintain, 360,000 years.

In further proof and illustration of the characteristics of the present dispensation, let us next refer to the parables of our Lord. In several of these, the condition of the world and the Church during the present age or dispensation is set forth under figure, or parable; and in each of these, the characteristics of the age are given as evil,—evil throughout, —evil to the last; evil augmenting, not diminishing with the progress of the ages. Evil, and its development during this dispensation, may be said to be the main burden of these parables. It might have been expected by the Church, that by the incarnation of the Eternal Son, and his sin-bearing work upon the cross, evil had been now arrested in the earth, and was forthwith to dry up from off its surface; the Lord teaches them that his coming would call up new forms of evil,—that instead of the good obtaining a speedy triumph over the evil, it would be trodden down, and that no amelioration in the world was to be expected, till he himself should return. His absence would leave room for new manifestations, new developments of evil; and by his personal presence were these to be brought to an end. In the parable of the *Sower*, we are taught that three at least, out of four classes of Gospel-hearers, reject the word proclaimed to them. This is to be the characteristic of the present dispensation, but not of the Millennial one. From the parable of the *Tares*, we learn that the false and the true are to be inseparably intermingled in this age; intermingled till "the Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that work iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." (Matt. xiii. 41, 42.) Where is there room for a Millennium here before the Advent? In the parable of the *Net*, we find the same statements as to the unbroken evil of the present age until the Lord come. From the parable of the afflicted widow, we

Digitized by Google

see that tribulation and oppression are to be the lot of the Church, up till the time when her Lord shall come. "Avenge me of mine adversary," is the cry of the Church on earth; "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood," is the pleading of the Church in heaven until the Lord come. And the parable indicates no cessation of the evil, but rather the increase of it, as the dispensation moves on to its close; for it is said, "When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith in the earth?" The parable of the ten virgins utters the same sad truth respecting the evil of the age. Even in the Church of Christ, one half at least is to be foolish, up to the moment when the Lord arrives.

It seems undeniable, that one special truth enunciated and dwelt upon by the Lord in these parables, was the uninterrupted,—nay, the augmenting evil of the present dispensation; evil which was not to be put an end to by the arrival of the Millennium, but by the arrival of the Lord. These two things are surely widely diverse from each other,—the arrival of the Millennium, and the arrival of the Lord. Nowhere in these parables,—nowhere in any other parts of Scripture, is the world's wide-spread wickedness said to be terminated by the arrival of the Millennial age; but in these parables, and in numerous passages of Scripture, is that wickedness said to be judged, avenged, and swept away by the coming of the Son of man.

In like manner, all the *Epistles* take for granted that the world would remain an ungodly, Christ-hating, persecuting world; and that, consequently, "tribulation" must of necessity be the Church's lot, until the Lord come. "Through much tribulation we must enter the kingdom of heaven;" "all that will live godly in Christ shall suffer persecution;" "save yourselves from this untoward generation;" "come out and be ye separate, and touch not the unclean thing." Such statements as these pervade all the Epistles, without one exception. They are all written for a suffering, not a triumphant Church,—for a "little flock," beset with enemies, assailed by Antichrist, tempted by an unholy world. In short, they all proceed upon the supposition, that there was to be no rest, no respite, no exemption from persecution, no Millennium, before the coming. The peculiar tone or tenor of these epistles is utterly inexplicable upon the theory of a post-millennial Advent; whereas, upon the opposite theory, all in them is consistent, harmonious, natural.

Take the apostle's statement in the eighth of the Romans. He tells us that the whole creation is groaning, and shall con-

Digitized by Google

tinue to groan; that the Church also is groaning, and shall continue to groan,—until the resurrection, or, as he expresses it, the "redemption of the body." Is not this a distinct intimation that the present evil condition of things, both in the world and in the Church, was to remain till the Lord should come to raise his saints, and to make all things new? (Ver. 23.)

Or take the same apostle's statement regarding Israel, in the eleventh chapter of the same Epistle. It is of Israel's blindness and unbelief that he is writing. That blindness is to continue during all the time of the filling up of the Gentile election, and is to be ended only by the Deliverer coming out of Sion, to turn away ungodliness from Jacob. (Ver. 26.)

Take, again, the prediction regarding the man of sin, in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. That Church had been cast into a state of trouble, in reference to the Lord's coming. This trouble the apostle seeks to remove. He does not tell them that the Lord was not to come,—or that the expected Advent was figurative, not literal. He merely declares that there was an intervening event which the Church was overlooking, the revelation of Antichrist. That man of sin had already begun to show himself,—he would continue to develop himself, rising in power and stature,—till smitten and swept away by that very event, for which they were then looking, viz., the Lord's coming. It was a literal and personal coming for which they were looking; it was a literal, personal coming, which the apostle declares to be postponed (if we may so speak); it is a literal, personal coming, which is spoken of in every other passage throughout these two Epistles (no less than twelve in number, and not one of these so strong, in respect of language, as the one before us); it is a literal, personal coming, to which the whole of the apostle's argument refers; and, therefore, we conclude that the coming to destroy Antichrist must of necessity be the literal, personal coming, and no other. The reign of Antichrist is then to be during the whole period of Christ's absence; and not till his return is that reign of evil broken in pieces.

Take, again, the apostle's Second Epistle to Timothy. There (iii. 1), he announces at large the awful truth, "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come," &c.—in which passage there is the distinct declaration, that during the last age, and up till the Lord's coming, was to be the special reign of evil,—evil of every name,—evil swelling and overflowing, as time went on.

Again, in the concluding part of the tenth chapter of the

Digitized by Google

Epistle to the Hebrews, there is the same announcement. Afflictions, reproaches, spoiling of goods,—these are given as the Church's heritage during this reign of evil. And what is her hope of deliverance? Not the Millennium, but the Lord's coming; for it is added, "Ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye may receive the promise, for yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry." (Ver. 27.)

Still more strongly does the Apostle James declare the same sad truth regarding the reign of evil, until the Lord come. He first addresses the world, warning them of the miseries coming upon the rich, the cankering of their gold and silver, their heaping up of treasure for the last days,—their defrauding of the labourer, their living in pleasure, their killing of the righteous. Then he turns to the Church, and tells them that such will be their lot until the Lord come. "Be patient, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord, ... be patient, stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh, ... behold the judge standeth before the door." (Vers. 1—9.)

We need not again refer to the authority of the Apostles Peter or Jude, in confirmation of these statements, as to the continuous and unbroken reign of evil until the Lord come. We have already dwelt upon the testimony of these two apostles, under another head. Let us briefly advert to the Apocalypse, as a testimony to the same effect. It takes for granted the reign of evil,—the dominion of Antichrists throughout the whole age. Look, for example, at the vials. All believe that they are to be poured out before the Millennium. Well, vial after vial is discharged, each bringing woes upon the earth for its iniquity; and just when the last vial is about to be poured out, the proclamation is made, "Behold I come as a thief, blessed is he that watcheth," (xvi. 15,) intimating, that as soon as this last stroke of vengeance had come down upon the world, then the Lord would come. It is clear, that the seals take for granted the reign of evil; that the trumpets take for granted the reign of evil,—and that the vials take for granted the same reign of evil, during the present age. And then, as if to complete the proof, the eighteenth chapter takes up Babylon,—the great enemy of God and of his Church,—describing her as the concentration of all evil, and depicting her overthrow by Him who comes out from the opened heaven, and on whose vesture there is written, "King of kings, and Lord of lords." Forthwith upon her downfall, there follow the triumphant song of the saints, and the

Digitized by Google

marriage supper of the Lamb. It is clear, that the reign of evil, which has been going on for ages, comes to a head in Babylon the great, and continues until the Advent and the marriage supper,—that Advent and festival being the commencement of Millennial peace and glory.

All these different passages and prophecies accord most fully with each other in one distinct announcement that the period between the first and second coming of the Lord, is a period of overflowing wickedness,—a reign of evil,—the era of Antichrists. "Little children, it is the last time, and as ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now are there many Antichrists, whereby we know that it is the last time."

In our own day, we see the reign of evil throughout the earth,—the progressive development of ungodliness and lawlessness. The sore runs, and ceases not; evil men and seducers wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived, —thus proclaiming aloud, "It is the last time." That bursting of bonds, and casting away of cords,—that raging of the heathen, and imagining of a vain thing among the nations,—that combining against the Lord and his anointed,—all these proclaim, "It is the last time." That hatred of law and rule, alike in things human and Divine,—that volcanic outburst of human passions which Europe is now witnessing,—that hatred of morality, of religion, of the Bible, of the Sabbath, of the Church,—of Christ, and of God himself; all these unite in saying, "It is the last time." And especially that dark spectral form, from which we now see rising amid the smoke and dust of this fiery warfare,—that man of sin, with Atheism for its soul, and Popery for its body,—that Prince of the blood-royal of hell, who is now preparing to rear his throne upon the wreck of other thrones, proclaims with awful distinctness, "It is the last time."

The world is now preparing for its last rejection of the Son of God; that last rejection which fills up the measure of its iniquities, and leads to God's bringing in of the rejected One as King of kings, and Lord of lords. It is casting about on every hand, to see if it can find a substitute for the true Messiah, in some system or person, embodying all its ideas of natural excellence, apart from God; natural wisdom, apart from the God only wise; natural beauty, apart from Him who is the fountain-head of all beauty. Were such an one to arise, he would be hailed as king, and the world, in its idolatry of the natural intellect, would not only allow him to usurp the place and assume the honours of

Digitized by Google

Messiah, the rightful heir of all things, but would welcome him as the true Christ, the Messiah of its choice, under whose shadow it would rejoice to dwell.

For it is not in mere negatives that the world will give utterance to its last rejection; it is to be in the direct and positive preference of another. It was so in the Jewish Church, when the Word was made flesh. There was first the negative, and then the positive, expression of their unbelief. At first, it was the former,—being simply, "not this man;" but as the crisis came, and a choice was forced upon them, it became at last, "not this man, but Barabbas." So shall it be with the apostate Gentile Church; whatever may have been the character of its past unbelief, its last form will be that of open rejection of the Christ, and daring preference of Antichrist.

Satan is leading on to this, and smoothing the way for the introduction of his own king. His first aim is to fill man with proud thoughts of himself. Man's rights, not man's duties, he brings into view; man's liberty, not man's obedience; man's power, not man's helplessness; man's independence, not man's dependance; man's enlightenment, not man's darkness! He is persuading men that they can do without a propitiation, without a Saviour, without a Messiah; that they can be prophet, priest, and king to themselves; that they can regenerate themselves by their improvements in education, and discoveries in art; that they can govern the world by their wise statesmanship and far-reaching diplomacy; that they can renew the face of earth, extract the curse, and uproot the thorn and briar, by their superior skill in the culture of the ground; that they can restore peace and order to the warring kingdoms, by congresses and leagues; that they can spread liberty over the globe, by reforms and constitutions and republics; that they can reunite their broken race, by reorganizing themselves into their original families and tribes, annihilating all barriers of oceans, mountains, and kingdoms; and when he has leavened them with these ideas (the development of his original lie, "ye shall be as gods"), he shall then, with cunning stealth, introduce his own representative, the false Messiah, the Antichrist, the man of sin, the mixture of Popery and Infidelity, the embodiment of man's religion and man's irreligion; of man's superstition and man's Atheism; of man's morality and man's licentiousness; —and arraying him in all the excellence in which the carnal eye delights, he will present him to an intoxicated world as their true Messiah, their own anointed King, whose yoke is

Digitized by Google

far easier, whose burden is far lighter, whose law is far freer, whose rule is far more blessed than that of God's Eternal Son.

Thus he shall persuade them; and the world, duped and befooled, shall wonder after and worship the Beast. God shall suffer it so to be. Yea, he shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie! and they who would not do homage to the Son of God, shall, in righteous retribution, be allowed to fall down before a lying impostor, the son of pride, the son of perdition, "that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

To a certain extent, we have already said, the positive as well as the negative rejection of Christ has been in past ages exhibited. "Not this man," was at first the cry of Pagan Rome; but as the struggle went on, that cry assumed more of the positive,—not this man, but Jupiter: not this man, but our hero-gods. In like manner, after Paganism had sunk, and Popery was shooting up and ripening, it was for a long time simply, "Not this man;" but when the strife arose, and the battle was waged, it came to be, "Not this man, but the Church; not this man, but the priest; not this man, but the Virgin." So, for a century past, during which Infidelity has been up-springing, the cry has been simply negative, "Not this man;" but now we may already see it changing, and passing over into the more positive form, as the crisis is making haste, "Not this man, but science; not this man, but philosophy; not this man, but liberty;" till it shall, ere long, merge yet more distinctly in the bold acclamation in behalf of Satan's representative, "Not this man, but Antichrist; not this man, but Barabbas,—*now Barabbas was a robber!*"

Thus all past rejections are to end in a yet darker, more direct, more daring rejection of the Christ of God, the rightful heir,—the world's true King; a rejection, through the positive preference of man for Satan's Messiah, whom he is now maturing. For as when old Paganism became hollow and effete, falling to pieces under its own weight and wickedness, Satan took of its goodly fragments and fair adornings, that, mingling them with Judaism and Christianity, he might construct for himself a temple, in which the true and the false were curiously interlaced,—the true, that it might allure and ensnare; the false, that it might neutralize the true. And now, when old Popery is beginning to crumble, he is taking of its rich materials, wherewith to build for him-

Digitized by Google

self yet another temple, in which the true and the false shall be even more cunningly interwoven, to deceive, if it were possible, the very elect, and to attract, yet more universally, the world's wondering crowds, the learned and the unlearned, the rich and the poor, the bigot and the liberalist, the despot and the anarchist, to worship this full-grown Antichrist, this embodiment of man's perfection, this radiant substitute for the Eternal Son of the Father.

And in what is this rejection to end,—this preference of Barabbas to Christ? In judgments, fiery, overwhelming judgments, of which we may even now perceive the cloudy signs. The long pent-up winds are beginning to break loose for the last storm; a storm that shall seem to bring back chaos, and cover earth with midnight. The sword of Jehovah is now unsheathing itself, and it shall not be replaced in its scabbard, until his own right hand and his holy arm have gotten him the victory.

And in what is this judgment, this vengeance to end? In the reign of peace, under the true Solomon; in the kingdom of righteousness, under the true Melchizedec. For it is not a *republic*, but a *kingdom* that we look for; it is not an era of equality that we look for (for who could admire an earth that was all one level round, or a garden where every flower was the same in fragrance and hue, or a heaven, where every star was like its fellow in size and glory?) but an era, when rank and degree and primogeniture, which we have hitherto seen but in shadow, shall be fully manifested as the very law and order of a happy universe; it is not a new dynasty that we expect, but the rightful heir himself; for whose claims God has, during the whole interval of absence and non-possession, been keeping up a protest, and whom he shall then introduce to the long misgoverned world as the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, who is to receive that dominion which the first Adam forfeited, and to share with his risen saints, his royal priesthood, the sovereignty of a creation, rescued from man's misrule, wrested from Satan's dominion, and re-cast in the primeval mould, according to that eternal purpose of Jehovah, which man and Satan have combined to frustrate; but whose accomplishment shall, by that very combination of the powers of evil, be only the more fully and the more gloriously brought to pass.

Digitized by Google

Art. VII.—LETTERS TO AN INQUIRER.

Letter III.

THE LINE OF PROOF.

My dear Friend,—We are entirely agreed as to the duty and necessity of appealing to the Bible in all matters of prophetical inquiry. We admit the sinfulness of seeking to determine any point respecting the things to come, in any other court, or upon any other authority.

But though the line of proof may be said to be thus far settled by consent, yet in carrying it out, there have been many divergences. Scripture has been often made use of, more for the end of overthrowing an opposite theory, than of directly building up our own. It has been sometimes taken for granted, that if we can only succeed in disproving or displacing a rival system, our own must, of necessity, be adopted in its room. Here much confusion has arisen, and at this point many a discussion has taken place, which ought to have been *postponed.*

I do not dispute the propriety of employing Scripture for the overthrow of what is false, I merely contend for the duty of *first* using it for the building up of what we conceive to be true. We should use it *positively,* before we use it *negatively.* We must not assume that *our* system must stand, if our opponent's can be broken up. Our first concern should be to consolidate that which we conceive to be true, ere we advance to the overthrow of what we believe to be false. Suppose the matter of discussion were the doctrine of justification by *faith.* Scripture is at once appealed to. But in what way, and for what end? Not for oversetting, in the first place, the doctrine of justification by *works.* That will come in by and by. But our first object is to establish by direct appeal to Scripture, the truth that we are justified by faith. We are not to exhaust our disproof of error, before we commence our proof of truth. Such a method would be circuitous and unsatisfactory. When we lay down a certain thesis, or statement, or point to be established, our first concern is to adduce the proofs in its favour. After these have been considered, we advance to the disproof of the opposing theory, whether that disproof be in direct passages or indirect difficulties.

Such ought to be our procedure in reference to prophetical questions. It is the usual procedure in other matters, and why not in these? Let us inquire into this.

Digitized by Google

There are several prophetical theories or systems promulgated in our day. But let us reduce them to three, or at least, let us consider the three leading ones. These may be called the pre-millennial, the post-millennial, and the non-millennial; in other words, the first holds the Advent to be *before* the Millennium; the second, *after* it; while the third denies that there is to be a Millennium at all. Suppose the premillennialist comes forward and lays down his thesis, we immediately ask him for *the proofs in favour of his system.* Were he to begin with stating the difficulties of the opposite view, and adducing proofs to show that other systems could not be true, we should arrest him forthwith as proceeding in a false line of argument. We should tell him, that we shall listen afterwards to all that he has to say regarding other systems, but that we expect that he will set about the direct and positive proof of his own, by bringing forward the explicit texts on which he grounds his belief that the Advent is before the Millennium. Were he to persist in his course and say, let me show you the disproof of post-millennialism, we ask him, of what use it is to proceed thus; for, though he overthrow that theory, he does not thereby erect his own, seeing here is a *non-millennialist* ready to step in and say, all that goes in favour of *my* system, as well as *yours.*

Or take the case of the post-millennialist. He lays down his thesis, that the Millennium is before the Advent, and offers to establish it from Scripture. We call for proof. He begins by showing us the difficulties, the dangers, the absurdities of pre-millennialism. He shows us how *it* sets aside Scripture, and revolts common sense. He shows how it is inconsistent with sound theology, and nullifies the various offices of Christ, as prophet, priest, and king. He shows how it introduces discord into the fundamental truths of Scripture, and ends by pronouncing it an impossibility and an impiety. But we interpose to ask, what is all this to his thesis? It may turn out, that he is correct in his averments; it may be demonstrated, that pre-millennialism is an unscriptural absurdity,—but does this establish his own post-millennial system? No. That is as far off as ever; for the non-millennialist is ready to show that all this abundant argument against pre-millennialism, goes entirely in his favour. What we ask for is, *direct and positive proof-texts to show that the Millennium is anterior to the Advent.* Let these be searched for and set in array,—but till these have been disposed of, we are not in the right position for pursuing the other line of argument.

Digitized by Google

Suppose the question respected some claim to an inheritance, made by two or more individuals, each seeking to have his right of heirship acknowledged by the judge. Would not each of these claimants set out by endeavouring to prove his own title, by adducing evidence of his heirship? Would he begin, by trying to invalidate the claims of the others, and to show that they were not the heirs? Granting that he proves that they are not, does that show that *he* is? They may have no claim to the estate, but he may have as little. He must lead evidence *for himself*, not merely *against them*. To invalidate their claim, is by no means to establish his own.

Thus far I have written, as if the case were a mere abstract or supposed one. But I need not conceal that I think it brings out the position which post-millennialists have hitherto occupied. Their efforts have been mainly directed to the disproof of our system, not to the positive and direct proof of their own. Take out of their works all that is written against us, and how much remains in favour of themselves? They seem to assume, that if *we* can but be non-plussed, then *they* must triumph; that if they can only silence us by a sufficient number of difficulties, they have succeeded in proving the truth of their theory, as a matter of course. They exhaust their strength in aiming blows at us, rather than in fortifying themselves. To invalidate our proofs, is reckoned by them equivalent to the establishing of their own.

In adopting this line of argument, they show the weakness of their cause, and that their hope lies chiefly in our overthrow. I am not disposed to affirm, that the argument by *reductio ad absurdum*, is false and illogical in itself. But it will only be adopted, where direct proof is awanting. No one who can lay hold of the direct, will prefer this indirect method. It will always be the last resort. And is it not natural for us to conclude that post-millennialists are hard pressed, when we see them drawing so largely upon this circuitous class of proofs? Not that I can concede to their arguments the force even of this indirect form of mathematical demonstration. For the geometrician in employing it, can go through with it, so as to make it really amount to positive demonstration. He can not only reduce one supposition to absurdity, but he is ready to take up every supposition, to show you that it is untenable. He can demonstrate, that *every* hypothesis, save *one*, is absurd. But can the post-millennialist do so? He does his utmost to prove that *one* of the theories opposed to his own is absurd; but can he traverse the entire round of every

Digitized by Google

possible theory in the same way? Yet, unless he can do so, his reasoning goes for nothing.

For our own part, we have no need of resorting to this line of argument. Our proof-texts are so abundant, so direct and so explicit, that to attempt anything of the kind, would be descending to a lower level, and a feebler mode of reasoning. Let them do this who stand in need of it. We do not. We are ready to state our system, to give our proofs, without so much as alluding to any other system.

We ask our post-millennial friends for a distinct statement of their thesis, to be followed up with equally distinct and positive evidence in its favour. What passage of Scripture places the Millennium before the Advent? There are many which speak of both these events, but which of them makes the Millennium to precede? Name them. We are ready to name ours.

In arguing the question, this is the true and lawful method. Each party has good right to insist upon the other's adducing positive evidence in favour of his own system, before advancing to the difficulties or absurdities of the other. Had this been always done, how much useless, how much angry discussion might have been spared? And surely, neither party could object to such a restriction of the discussion, or to such an order in the line of argument. If we are slow to bring up our proofs, and prefer assailing an opponent, in what we conceive to be his weak points, we shall give good reason for suspecting that *our* weak points require more covering than *his*. I am, yours, &c.,

October, 1848. ———.

Letter IV.

TREATMENT OF DIFFICULTIES.

My dear Friend,—I hope to call your attention, ere long, to what are reckoned the difficulties of Millennarianism. Meanwhile, let me just assume that these do exist. The question is, how are we to treat them? What weight ought they to have? What place ought they to occupy?

Let us treat them as what they profess to be,—difficulties, but nothing more. They have too often been adduced and wielded against us, as if they were much more,—as if they were positive proofs on the side of our opponents. This they cannot be. To reckon them as such, would be to alter their

Digitized by Google

character entirely. Difficulties are barriers in the way of conclusions, but they can never legitimately be used as proof. They may arrest conclusions,—they may lead us to review and suspect our proof, but further than this they cannot go.

Now I complain of our opponents that they do not make a fair or lawful use of the difficulties to which I refer. They employ them in a way and for a purpose to which they cannot legitimately be applied. They first use them as proofs against us, and then as proofs in behalf of their own system. They commence with stating that there are several difficulties which they conceive lie in our way. Then they advance a step farther and maintain that these difficulties are decided evidence that our system cannot be true. Then they insist upon passing on to the ultimate conclusion that their system, as being exempt from such difficulties, must be the true one.

Take, for example, the conflagration predicted in the third chapter of Second Peter. We are asked, how can there be men surviving that universal burning; how can the rivers, mountains, cities of the earth remain the same, or very much the same, after it has taken place? Such a difficulty lying in our way, we are told that our theory *cannot* be true,—that it is vain to appeal to texts in its favour, for here is a difficulty which at once declares it to be impossible and therefore far beyond the reach of proof. All positive texts in its favour, must go for nothing so long as such a difficulty stands in the way. Then, thinking this difficulty strong enough and solid enough to bear the weight of a farther inference, they insist that they are warranted in concluding that their theory must be correct, seeing it is opposed to ours and free from such a difficulty.

Surely this is introducing the difficulty at a wrong place and employing it for a purpose altogether illegitimate. No difficulty, unless of the most thoroughly insoluble and self-contradictory kind, can go half such a length as this.

It is remarkable that this method of handling difficulties has been made use of by many of the opponents of vital truth. This is precisely the use which Socinians made of the difficulties which are supposed to lie in the way of the belief of the Godhead of the Lord Jesus Christ. These enemies of the Son of God take their stand upon this very ground. They busy themselves with starting *difficulties*. They brandish these *difficulties* in our face. To all our proof-texts they oppose these *difficulties*. In answer to our demand for proof, they enumerate their *difficulties*. In vain we urge them to come at once to the positive proof of their *thesis*;

Digitized by Google

they keep aloof from this; they wrap themselves up in these difficulties; they tell us that in consequence of these they regard Trinitarianism as a doctrine not admitting of proof, and that therefore we ought to acquiesce in their system as being free from such incumbrances and contradictions.

In like manner Professor Bush, of America, has dealt with the doctrine of the Resurrection, in a work published a few years ago. He sets out with an elaborate statement of the *difficulties* in the way of resurrection. He enumerates and dwells on these at length, presenting them with considerable force. He entrenches himself behind these as behind an impregnable rampart,—a rampart impregnable alike to reason and Scripture. Finally, he sums up by announcing that "the physiological fact of the constant change which our bodies are undergoing is irreconcileably at war with the tenet of the resurrection of our bodies." (P. 390.) In vain we adduce texts, facts, types, figures; he has a ready reply to all of them in the *difficulties* of our doctrine. Resurrection, he asserts, *cannot* be true, it is *incapable* of proof from its very nature: our system must be false, and therefore we ought to embrace his, as the only one which involves no such absurdities.

Nay, further, the mode of argument against which we are contending is, when analyzed, the same in essence with Hume's boasted argument against miracles. His object is to magnify the difficulties of a miracle so as to represent it as a thing incapable of proof. He does not treat difficulties *as difficulties,* but as positive evidence against his opponent's sentiments and in favour of his own.

This is what we complain of in the controversy to which these letters refer. Difficulties are not treated simply as difficulties, of which a solution is to be sought, but are magnified into something beyond, and entirely different from their proper nature and use.

Had these difficulties stood in the way of a doctrine very rarely and very obscurely alluded to in Scripture,—a doctrine which rested confessedly upon most slender proof, I should be willing to allow them more force than I have above admitted as belonging to them. To receive a doctrine upon very narrow and suspicious evidence, in the face of formidable difficulties, is rash and unreasonable. But even here surely we ought first to inquire into that evidence in order to discover whether it be really as weak as it is said to be. If there be no evidence or if it be proved to be wholly

Digitized by Google

unsatisfactory, let the difficulties rule the case. But let the evidence, whether real or pretended, be first disposed of.

These difficulties are two-fold; first rational, and secondly theological. It is often argued that millennarianism is altogether contrary to reason,—that its chief points are altogether at variance with common sense. It is argued again that millennarianism is opposed to all sound theology,—that it subverts the truths which we hold to be most vital,—that it is the introduction to all heresy,—that it is carnal in its very nature, and derogatory to the Lord Jesus Christ.

But these classes of difficulties are, to say the least of them, indirect, and founded upon inferences of our own,—inferences, I must say, of the most vague and unsatisfactory nature. Are we to judge of a doctrine by its supposed conformity to our reason? Are we to measure the truth of a doctrine by its approximation or non-approximation to a general theological standard, apart from the direct Word of God on which it professes to be based? Are we to say of a doctrine, it cannot be true, it is incapable of proof, because it is at variance with what we consider reasonable, and with our inferences from certain theological data?

Besides, this method of reasoning takes for granted that a doctrine, if true, should be attended with no difficulties,—that freedom from difficulties is a test of truth; and that the occurrence of these is an indication of error somewhere, most likely at the very foundation.

Is it so? Do we acknowledge such a criterion in other doctrines? Nay, do we not utterly reject it? Do we not expect that what is divine should be attended with more difficulties than what is human? That which is false may call up no difficulties, by reason of its poverty, its barrenness, its littleness; but that which is true cannot fail to do so, for its depth, its vastness, its infinite connexions on every side, must inevitably bring it into contact with that which is inscrutable and hard to be understood. "It is absolutely impossible," says a late French, or rather Swiss, writer, "that a true religion should not present a great number of mysteries. If it is true it ought to teach more truths respecting God and Divine things than any other, than all others together; but each of these truths has a relation to the infinite, and by consequence borders on a mystery. . . . . It is clearly necessary that Christianity should, more than any other religion, be mysterious, simply because it is true. Like mountains, which the higher they are, cast the larger shadows, the Gospel is

Digitized by Google

the more obscure and mysterious on account of its simplicity. After this, will you be indignant that you do not comprehend everything in the Gospel?" *

Let me say, then, in general, with reference to these difficulties: 1st. Let us beware of assigning to them an improper place in the argument; 2dly. Let us beware of turning them to an improper use; 3dly. Let us beware of setting them down as evidences of the false, instead of being, as they often are, *the necessary accompaniments of the true.*

I am, yours, &c.,

November, 1848. ———

Notes on Scripture.

Proverbs xxi. 21.

"He that followeth after righteousness and mercy, findeth life, righteousness, and honour."

1. We have here the sinner pursuing after salvation. He looks to God as manifesting himself in atonement, at Israel's altar, in "*righteousness,*" and yet in "*mercy.*" Therein he sees the way of acceptance, a *just* God and a *Saviour.*

2. We then see the result. Being justified by faith, being accepted at the altar, the sinner finds *life*. The sentence, "Thou shalt die," is for ever reversed; and all else connected with that sentence is repealed. *Life* is his, in all its aspects. Nay more; he has got "*righteousness;*" a legal claim to reward; a legal title to whatever he needs from the storehouse. He is in possession of far more than pardon.

And then, last of all, he finds himself prospectively in possession of "honour." As yet, indeed, this *honour* is scantily given; the world hates him, and he is often despised and scorned. But it is in reversion. It is yet to be his. The second coming of the Lord is the time of "*honour.*" As in Romans ii. 7, "Glory, honour, and immortality," are put together, as the *after* reward, so in 1 Cor. xv. 43, the opposite of "*dishonour*" is "*glory,*" at the resurrection of the just.

Haggai ii. 23.

Without entering into the question as to whether there is a double prophecy contained in these words, we would remark that one part of their obvious meaning seems to be overlooked. They seem to us to convey to Zerubbabel such a promise as that which is given to Daniel, in these words, "Go thou thy way till the end be; for thou shalt rest,

* Vinet, "Essays and Discourses," p. 48.

Digitized by Google

and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." (xii. 13.) In Daniel's case it is evidently a promise of resurrection, glory, and blessedness in the promised kingdom, and why should not the promise in Haggai refer to the same period, and be a promise of honour and glory in reserve for Zerrubbabel (the literal Zerubbabel we mean), in the day of the kingdom? "In that day will I take thee, O Zerubbabel, my servant, the son of Shealtiel, and will make thee as a signet, for I have chosen thee saith the Lord of Hosts." Blessed, honoured servant! A bright reward is thine at the resurrection of the just! As the signet on the King's right hand, exalted to regal power, and refulgent with regal glory in the kingdom of the risen saints! Brief is the record of thy history on earth, but thou shalt shine in the kingdom with surpassing glory.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

2 Cor. v.

Not a few of the advocates for our Lord's personal reign upon earth have maintained views with regard to the intermediate state of the soul, which are adverse to the doctrine upon that subject most generally held amongst Protestant divines.

Is there any necessary connexion between the doctrine of our Lord's reign upon earth and the opinion that the separate spirit is more or less in a state of unconsciousness? Or is the view of the future glory permitted to become so absorbing as to throw too much into the shade, the intervening bliss of the separate spirit? Or does the difference of opinion arise from the different modes of interpreting Scripture, which are severally adopted by the spiritualists and literalists?

There is no conceivable connexion between the doctrines above-mentioned, but it is possible that the mind, when in a state of transition from the belief in a spiritual, to that of a literal reign, may be susceptible of impressions, which lead to erroneous views.

It is not long after the belief in our Lord's personal reign upon earth is received, that the student discovers passages which have been incautiously applied to the separate spirit in heaven, but which do in truth refer to the state of glory upon earth, and as these are one after another pressed upon his mind, he finds that the popular view in many instances is not soundly maintained, and he begins to suspect that the doctrine has not any scriptural support, and is nothing more than a corollary from the current belief of the day with regard to our Lord's kingdom.

There is always danger, when giving up error, that some truth which has been held together with the error may be resigned with it also: faith, when it has been abused and overburdened, becomes suspicious, and the reaction of extreme credulity is not unfrequently infidelity, either secret or avowed. In the present case, though the error is uncomfortable rather than perilous, the danger of falling into it is great, in consequence of so many texts having been wrongly applied in support of the orthodox faith, and there really being but few in the

Digitized by Google

New Testament which do properly relate to it. But it will be perceived that there is no necessity for holding the one doctrine because of a belief in the other. The error has in fact been occasioned by the erroneous manner in which the truth has been maintained.

Nevertheless, his suspicions being aroused, the inquirer sets himself diligently to examine the question, and he is next influenced by perceiving that in passages where he would have expected mention of the intermediate state, he finds no notice of it whatever, but on the contrary the kingdom of glory is prominently held forth as the object of the believer's expectancy. The intermediate state being thus passed over in silence, he now more than suspects that it is a condition of apathy rather than of active bliss.

But this argument is without force, if the different standing point of believers now, and believers to whom the apostles wrote is borne in mind. We look back over the long period which has elapsed since our Lord's ascension, and unwarily suppose that the fact, which in its retrospection influences us, must have been prospectively contemplated by them, and that if so, an intermediate state of bliss would have been a subject of much too deep an interest to be passed over in silence. But we ought rather to place ourselves in their position and then consider whether a dilation upon the bliss of the intermediate state would indeed have proved a theme of consolation.

Our Lord's own followers were called upon to be in constant watchfulness and expectation of his re-appearing, and in consequence of this the apostles spoke and wrote in the practical contemplation of his return before the passing away of the generation which they were addressing. Then it evidently follows that the great subject of hope which would be held before the believer, would not be the intermediate state, even though that intermediate state were exceedingly glorious: and this not simply because the period before Christ's return is spoken of, comparatively, as "a very little time," but because, from the language of the apostles, the great majority of those addressed by them must have concluded that they might be amongst those who would not pass through the intermediate state at all.

What other conclusion could have been drawn by the Thessalonians, when St. Paul comforted them with the thought of Jesus bringing back those that were asleep, and that "we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air" (1 Thess. iv. 17)? Now it would be almost irrelevant to expatiate upon the bliss of the intermediate state, for it would disturb the idea of speedy re-union in perfected bliss, which the apostle wished to convey; all that we could expect would be some incidental mention of the place or condition of the spirits of the perfected just, and that we have in the assertion that God will bring them back with Jesus, a necessary inference from their sleeping * in Jesus, who has died and risen again.

* They may be said to sleep in Jesus, not because of the dormancy of their spirits, but because they have not the use of their outward senses. The mind and fancy are often active when the outward senses are in repose, and this is the state which we call sleep.

Digitized by Google

Hence it will be perceived that the error does not consist in giving too much prominence to the hope of our Lord's reign upon earth, but rather to the want of seizing the subject of condolence most proper for those addressed in the apostolic epistles.

Thus far, it will be perceived, the arguments derived from the New Testament in support of the sleep of the soul, are in their nature merely negative. But one who has been brought to believe in our Lord's personal reign upon earth, has learned neither to neglect nor to spiritualize the language of the Old Testament, and there he finds that Sheol or Hades (Ps. xvi. 10, with Acts ii. 27; Hos. xiii. 14, with 1 Cor. xv. 55) is mentioned as the receptacle of separate spirits; that to Sheol the Patriarchs descended (Gen. xxxvii. 35); that to Sheol the soul of Jesus descended (Ps. xvi. 10), and that Sheol is the place into which the wicked shall be turned (Ps. ix. 17); that Sheol has already, in one instance, been the receptacle of the body as well as of the soul (Num. xvi. 30, 33), and that ultimately Sheol will be the place of punishment of both body and soul. (Prov. xv. 24, Matt. x. 28, Rev. xix.) If then the souls of the righteous and wicked are all in one common receptacle, he is apt to conclude that none are in glory, nay, he cannot conceive, that, if mingled together with the wicked, the souls of the righteous are in a state of bliss or even of consciousness.

Here the arguments, it will be admitted, are not negative but positive, but then the subject is a little changed. Instead of the powers and condition of the separate spirit these texts go to show the place of the separate state. From the comparative silence of the New Testament, the apathy of the soul is inferred; from the positive statements of the Old Testament as to the place of separate souls, it is next supposed that the incidental mention once or twice of being with Christ cannot refer to any active bliss in the presence of the Lord, but at most to some state of negative consciousness of glory in anticipation.

In order to answer this part of the argument, only some discrimination is necessary. We must first distinguish between the different parts of Hades allocated to the souls of the righteous and of the wicked, *before* the ascension of our Lord; and we must next decide as to the place and state of blessed spirits *since* he has been "received up into glory."

We read of the "lowest hell," and of "the depths of hell" (Deut. xxxii. 22, Ps. lxxxvi. 13, Prov. ix. 19), expressions which, while they denote a part of the unseen world which is appointed for the wicked, do also imply that there are other regions in "the nether parts of the earth." There are similar expressions also in the New Testament, such as the bottomless pit (Rev. xx. 1), and Gehenna * (Matt. x. 28), and the lake of fire (Rev. xix. 20, and xx. 15), corresponding with

* Gehenna is not mentioned before Joshua's time, the pollution of the valley at that time being the occasion. In the eighty-eighth Psalm there are several names for the intermediate state, verse three, Sheol; verse four, Bor, the pit; verse six, the lowest pit and darkness; verse eleven, Abaddon, destruction; verse twelve, the land of forgetfulness, or of oblivion.

Digitized by Google

that part of Hades in which Dives was, "being in torments." (Luke xi. 23.)

But in Sheol or Hades there were also blissful regions, although the names of them are chiefly "brought to light" in the New Testament; for in this, as in other respects, the saints of former dispensations were much in the dark, and therefore all their lifetime subject to bondage. (Heb. ii. 15, Ps. lxxxviii.)

Abraham's bosom (Luke xvi. 22, 30) was the region of the dead, for Abraham was in Sheol. The parable also intimates that Dives and Lazarus were both in the same place, but separated by a gulf.

It is generally supposed that "Paradise" occurs first in the New Testament, but the term appears to be derived from the Old Testament (Neh. ii. 8, Eccl. ii. 5), and in Cant. iv. 13 it seems to refer, though enigmatically, to the separate state of believers. The same figure, however, though under a different term, is applied more explicitly to the intermediate state by Ezekiel. (Ezek. xxxi. 16.) In the song we have, "Thy plants are a paradise of pomegranates," the plants are "trees of righteousness," as pomegranates they are fruitful ones, in paradise, a fenced place, a state of security; Ezekiel speaks of these as "trees of Eden," the garden of the Lord, in "the nether parts of the earth." These two passages, when taken in combination, may doubtless be considered as having originated this use of the term. So our Lord, when he descended into "the lower parts of the earth" (Eph. iv. 9), went "into Paradise,"—the Paradise to which he promised the thief admission that very day. (Luke xxiii. 43.)

By discriminating between the different compartments in Hades, and again between the state of believers before and after the ascension of our Lord, I believe we are able successfully to meet all the passages which are, by some, considered positive in their testimony against the doctrine that "the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord do live with Almighty God."—*Church of England Burial Service.* Under former dispensations, the souls of saints and sinners were alike in Hades, but they did not jostle with each other; there was a wide gulf between "the bosom of Abraham" and the "belly of hell." Again, though the souls of Old Testament believers did descend into Hades, what hinders that the spirits of the perfected just should now ascend to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to God, the judge of all?

Towards the maintenance of this last opinion I will now advance some remarks, chiefly derived from 2 Cor. v. The reasons why I prefer this passage are, because some who do not look for our Lord's reign upon earth think that it supports their view of heaven being the place of the perfect consummation and bliss of the believer; and because others, who do look for our Lord's reign, are divided as to whether this passage refer to the ultimate or the intermediate state;* and lastly, because I believe that in this passage the doctrine has its principal seat, in other

* I have also been able to take advantage of Dr. Goodwin's exposition of the passage. Manton has also written a course of sermons on the chapter, but they are practical rather than argumentative.

Digitized by Google

texts of Scripture, the mention being more incidental, for the reason I have already assigned.

St. Paul, in the preceding context, (2 Cor. iv. 13,) declares, notwithstanding the great persecutions he endured, that he continued to speak because he has the same spirit of faith as the Lord Jesus, who in Psalm xvi. 9 says, "I will walk before the Lord in the land of the living; I believed, therefore have I spoken."* He next (ver. 14) enlarges upon this hope concerning the resurrection glory, "knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus" (who is the speaker in Psalm xvi.) "shall raise us up also through Jesus, and shall present us with you." "Us," if delivered to death, "together with you," if you live till the second Advent; for all the sufferings he underwent were in order to bring them to glory; and further, that their hallelujahs might amply redound to the glory of God. (Ver. 15.) "Therefore," the assurance of his own awaiting bliss, the desire of theirs, and the zeal which he had for God's glory, prevented him from fainting.

"Therefore we faint not, but even though our outward man is decaying, yet our inward [man] is renewed day by day." (Ver. 16.)

So completely the reverse from fainting, so independent is the inner man of the outer, that the constant renewal of the one is progressing, as the decay of the other is advancing. It is this inner man which is "strengthened with might by God's Spirit" (Ephes. iii. 16); and its tastes are quite opposite to the desires of the outer man, for it "delights in the law of God." (Rom. vii. 22.) How is it possible to suppose that this inner man, growing up to maturity independently of the body, the immediate susceptive of the Spirit's influence and invigoration, which has tastes and delights in exact accordance with the holiness of God, which is, therefore, striving to be delivered from the body of sin and death; how, I say, is it possible to suppose that when absent from the body, its delights will terminate in oblivion; its susceptibility of the Spirit's influence will change to apathy; its vigour and activity will become listlessness and torpor?

The apostle says, "*even though*," as taking the worst view of what can befall him; for he speaks afterwards of preferring translation to dissolution.

"For our light momentary affliction, is working out for us an exceedingly excelling [and] eternal weight of glory." (Ver. 17.)

The "us," in ver. 17, is the "inner man" of the former verse, which henceforth, through the discourse, bears the personality. We subsequently learn (2 Cor. v. 5), that the fitting of this inner man for glory, whilst the old is decaying, is the immediate work of God.

There is an antithesis between "a moment," and "eternity;" in the moment is misery, in eternity is glory; the unseen state comes under one or other, but certainly it is not a condition of misery to the believer. This is confirmed by the following verse, for there the division is between things seen and not seen, and things temporary and

* Professor Scholefield observes, "The particle which is omitted in the common version forms an important connexion with the preceding verse."

Digitized by Google

eternal; the seen things are temporary, the unseen are eternal; the unseen state, therefore, is part of the eternity of glory.

"While we look not [are not aiming] at the things seen, but at those not seen; for the things seen are temporary, but the things not seen are eternal." (Ver. 18.)

This verse limits the *subject* and the *nature* of these afflictions which work out beneficially; it is the afflictions of those aiming at, and in consequence of their aiming at unseen and eternal things.

Now the question is, when the outward man is entirely decayed, what becomes of that inner man which has been strengthened with all might, which has been delighting in all holiness, and which has been fitting for an eternal weight of glory? This the apostle proceeds to show in the following verses.

"For we know that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens." (Chap. v. 1.)

Paul enforces what he says in chap. iv. 17, by affirming his consciousness of the awaiting glory.

"The earthly house of our tabernacle," appears to be the same as "the outward man." (2 Cor. iv. 16.) The apostle sets up a comparison of two houses, the tabernacle with the temple (as he did before of two men), the inner man removing from one to the other. It is a house, with respect to the inhabitant, a soul in a body: it is a tabernacle, with regard to its frailty, easily taken down and removed.

In expressing the supposition of death, the apostle keeps up the distinction between the mortal body, and the "we," or the "inner man." He does not say, "if we die," which might involve the fate of both body and soul; the expression seems chosen with the intent to intimate such a separation as would mark the continued existence of the inner man, which still bears the personality.*

"Earthly house" is here in opposition to the other members of the sentence.

Earthly.—I. As to the place, in opposition to that "in the heavens."
II. From earth, as to its substance, in opposition to the "building from God."
1. Its composition. (Gen. xviii. 27; Job iv. 19.)
2. Sustentation. (Ps. civ. 114.)
3. Dissolution. (Gen. iii. 19; Eccl. xii. 7; Ps. cxlvi. 4.)
III. By intervention of earthly parents, in opposition to being "not made with hands."

The "inner man" can say immediately upon dissolution, "we have," not "we shall have;" St. Paul is speaking of the immediate issue, —it is a point of time, a state ensuing upon dissolution, it is the same as "when our earthly house is dissolved." The apostle is not showing what will be the state of the "inner man," when it shall again be re-united to its body, but in the interim when subsisting out of the body. The glorified body will not come from heaven, but from the

* With Peter, in like manner, under the same figure, the inner man bears the personality, "Shortly I must put off [this] my tabernacle. (2 Peter i. 14.)

Digitized by Google

earth; the very body which is sown in corruption, will be raised in glory. The building here spoken of, is "in the heavens."

The apostle says, "We know . . . that we have a building from God;" not a bare conjecture of a general truth, but a confident assurance of a particular application; "we," not "I," not Paul alone, but all the saints have assurance of the object, and should have of the subject; there is the certainty of the thing, and should be the confidence of the person.

I do not know whether there is any force in what I am going to offer, but it has struck me that the mode of introducing this verse, does not imply that St. Paul derived his knowledge of this truth, by being the first who was inspired to communicate it. He does not say, "I delivered unto you that which I also received," but, "*We* know," it is a generally received truth. I will at any rate pause and consider whether he might not have derived his knowledge by other means, viz., previous revelation, and ocular demonstration.

First, as to previous revelation. Our adorable Lord had promised that "the gates of Hades" should not prevail against his Church. (Matt. xvi. 18.) Now, though I know another interpretation is generally put upon this promise, the simple meaning seems to be, that the souls of believers should henceforth be no more detained in Hades than his was.

Our blessed Lord, moreover, prays that his people may behold his glory (John xvii. 24), not the glory which he would share with them (ver. 22), but the incommunicable glory which he had with the Father. Now, as the former promise was only with regard to Hades, and not the grave, so the being with Christ where he now is, is not extended to the body, but is the exalted state of the separate spirit; and this not only marks the place where the disembodied spirits are, but also their capability of apprehending the manifestations of his glory.

Christ also promises Peter (John xiii. 36), that he shall follow him, by laying down his life; but though Peter was to lay down his life, our Lord also declares that his people have eternal life, and shall never die. From all these passages, it might undoubtedly be inferred, that the spirit, when absent from the body, would be present with the Lord, in a state of consciousness, with an unbounded possession of life. But it may be a question, whether these promises were generally known by the disciples before John's Gospel was penned.

But may not St. Paul's own personal experience have been sufficient to enlighten him? He was caught up into the third heaven, and received wondrous revelations, some of which were unutterable; and he was not conscious whether he himself at the time of these manifestations, was in the body or out of the body. Clearly, then, in his estimation, the intervention of the body was in no degree necessary for the spirit's reception of heavenly knowledge and glory, and may we not conclude that he actually saw the spirits of the perfected just before the throne, as well as the unutterable glory of the beatific vision?

The question as to how St. Paul derived his knowledge, may, however, be rather curious than important; we will, therefore, pass on to

Digitized by Google

consider the truth revealed. The soul or spirit, immediately upon dissolution, is to have a house, in place of the earthly tabernacle; what is that house? Not the glorified body, as I have already observed, for that comes not from the heavens. We may say, that according to original constitution, it was not good for the soul of man to dwell alone; as severed from the body, it is an imperfect being; may not the heavenly house supply the imperfection of the naked spirit, giving it a defined form*, and whatever else is necessary for communion in the heavenly state?

"There seems," says Dr. Engel, "no foundation whatever for supposing that our souls are destined to pass from an alliance with bodily organs into a purely spiritual condition; some instrumentality for the purpose of receiving and communicating ideas, appears, in fact, not only to be a requisite for the original development of the human mind, but an inseparable necessity of its peculiar nature." (Quoted by Muston, on "Future Recognition.") Perhaps, one scarcely knows sufficiently, what a purely spiritual condition is, so as to be able to pronounce positively upon it; but I think the spirit will have a defined form, as well as powers necessary for communicating and receiving spiritual impressions.

Not being made with hands, implies that it is the immediate creation of God (see Heb. ix. 11), without the intervention of second causes. It is "eternal," because it is "life" (Rom. viii. 10), subject to no decay, and it is "in the heavens." The spirits of the perfected just are with the angels and Jesus, &c. (Heb. xii. 23); and as the clouds dispelled give a clear sight of the sun, so the body being dissolved, the soul is enabled to behold the unclouded glory of the Lord.

"For in this [respect] we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed with our house from heaven."

The metaphor in this verse does not appear to me changed; the allusion in this and the preceding verse being to the curtains of the tabernacle.

The groans here mentioned, refer rather to the vehement desires after the heavenly house, than to the burdens of the regenerate mentioned in the fourth verse. In verse 1, the apostle declares the Christian's faith concerning the glory; in verse 2, he shows the effects, and the workings of the heart towards that glory, as flowing from this faith; for living faith works upon the affections suitably to the object known or believed, for affections follow persuasions; hence the glory proposed in the first verse as the object of our faith, is the object of our desires in the second and fourth verses.

The vehement desires implanted in the saints for this glory, demonstrate that it is prepared for them; for God's Spirit works not desires after a glory which there is not,—"Blessed are they that hunger . . . for they shall be filled." (Matt. v. 6.) "The Lord will fulfil the desires of them that fear him," (Ps. cxlv. 19,) whether righteousness here, or glory hereafter. Now, the more holy men are, the stronger

* What did the wondering, doubting disciples understand by Peter's angel? (Acts xii. 15.) A spiritual form, having the exact appearance of Peter.

Digitized by Google

are these desires, which shows that they are the implanting of the Holy Spirit. The nearer that Christian men approach their change, the more vividly, generally speaking, do they realize the unseen world. What a wound do we give to all experimental religion, if we say that so many pre-eminently holy ones leave this world under a delusion!

The object desired is the "house from heaven," not the glorified body, that is from earth.

The right grounds of this groaning are:—

1. A complete assurance of our state being "far better." (Phil. i. 23.)
2. A desire of nearest conjunction, fullest fruition, and closest communion with the Lord, "To depart and be with Christ."

If our version of verse 3, is correct, I conceive the meaning to be, "We earnestly desire to be clothed with our house from heaven, since being clothed, we shall not be found naked before the tribunal of Christ." The expression "found," refers to the day of judgment in 2 Peter iii. 14; Phil. iii. 9; Matt. xxiv. 46; and for being "naked," or "ashamed" in the same connexion, see 1 John ii. 28; Rev. iii. 18, and Rev. xvi. 15. But the late John Walker, whose critical acumen was a handmaid to great spiritual discernment, says, "I am quite satisfied that we ought to read—'*inasmuch as*, EVEN *when unclothed*, we shall not be found naked;'—that is, when divested of the earthly tabernacle, we shall be invested with an heavenly. This reading," he adds, "is marked by Griesbach as worthy of attention; but appears to me decisively recommended to our adoption, as well by the plain and consistent sense which it affords, as by allowing its proper force of EVEN to the conjunction."*—("Walker's Remarks corrective," &c., vol. ii., p. 70.) I would add, that there is an air of paradox, which though by no means foreign to St. Paul's style, might account for some transcriber changing a letter, in order to remove what he might think a difficulty. I still, however, think, that the saying, "we shall not be found naked," is suggestive of the day of judgment which the apostle expressly mentions in the tenth verse, and to which, indeed, the verse immediately following looks forward.

"For we that are in the tabernacle do groan being burdened, not because we wish to be unclothed but clothed upon, that the mortal may be swallowed up of life." (2 Cor. v. 4.)

St. Paul appears to me to allude to what he had told the Corinthians in his former epistle, (1 Cor. xv. 45—53,) and he here shows that the earnest desire for the house from heaven, is not incompatible with the desire for the mortal to put on immortality, without the separation of soul and body. It seems to correspond with the alternative proposed in chap. iv. 16, where he shows, that though of the two dissolution is less to be desired than translation, yet that upon dissolution there is a weight of glory for the separate spirit, and thus the consideration of the intermediate state was introduced; but in this verse, the apostle looks

* Professor Scholefield, following the authorised version, says, "Literally, 'having put [it] on.'" The one reading refers to putting on the heavenly house, the other, to putting off the earthly tabernacle.

Digitized by Google

forward to the more preferable state of resurrection glory, for the groaning is not a longing to get rid of the body, even though the body be a burden,—but on the contrary, there is a panting for complete glorification. But if now, upon dissolution, we are clothed upon with our house from heaven, we shall not be found naked, before the tribunal of Christ, at the day of judgment, but shall then receive the fruition of bliss, both in body and soul, which hope makes us confident in death, without our preferring death.

"We in the tabernacle do groan," still marking that the inner man bears the personality, also intimating another existence of the saints, viz., "out of the tabernacle," not "in *this* tabernacle," in opposition to another tabernacle, but "in *the* tabernacle," in contradistinction to those out of the tabernacle. (Ver. 9.)

It is "we" only "in the tabernacle," who groan; this is different from the desire of the separate spirit for full fruition.

"Groan, being burdened." It is true that we are burdened, having a body of sin and death, nevertheless, what we desire is not to be unclothed, but clothed upon. It is not the unnatural desire of death, as such—death which was introduced by sin; a creature does not desire its own deprivation; nature abhors death, but grace desires glory.

"That the mortal may be swallowed up of life." This explains, without a figure, the desire of a devout soul. But it refers, I apprehend, exclusively to the "mortal body," not to "the spirit which is life," not to "the inner man," which has already "passed from death unto life." I have mentioned, that St. Paul probably refers to what he had already told the Corinthians, that "this mortal shall put on immortality." It will therefore be advisable to glance for a moment at that passage.

"There is," says he, "a natural body, and there is a spiritual body," (1 Cor. xv. 44); the natural body is that which we derive from our first parents, informed and actuated by the soul: "And so it is written, the first man Adam was made a living soul" (ver. 45), and all his descendants bear his image. "As [was] the earthy (that is, Adam), such [are] they also that are earthy" (ver. 48); as was Adam, such are all the descendants of Adam. Now, as a natural or *soulish* body, is a body formed from the earth for, and actuated by a soul, so a spiritual body is, by parity of reasoning, a body formed suitably for, and actuated by a quickening spirit. And this is what I understand the apostle to affirm.

The spiritual body has a relation to "the last Adam," similar to the relation which the natural or soulish body has to the first Adam. "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam [was made] a quickening spirit." (Verses 44 and 45.) The forty-sixth verse then shows the order, first the natural, then the spiritual; the forty-seventh verse shows the nature of the federal head in each case, "the first man [was] of the earth, earthy," &c.; then, as I apprehend, the forty-eighth verse, which marks that the change shall be in conformity with the order mentioned in verse 46, should run thus,—"As

Digitized by Google

[was] the earthy, such they also [are] that are earthy: and as [is] the heavenly, such they also [shall be] that are heavenly,"—"and (therefore) as we have borne the image of the earthy (that is, the first Adam), we shall also bear the image of the heavenly," that is, the second Adam. Now, as the apostle is speaking of the image of the first Adam borne by his descendants, in their having living souls actuating earthy bodies, so the image of the second Adam to be borne by heavenly ones in the resurrection must be their constitution as quickening spirits.

Three particulars are predicated as the suitability of the spiritual body for actuation by a life-giving spirit. It will be incorruptible (ver. 42), or immortal (ver. 53), glorious (ver. 43), like Christ's glorious body (Phil. iii. 21), and potent (ver. 43). Sometimes in Scripture, spirit and power are opposed to flesh and weakness. In writing to the Corinthians, St. Paul says, "The weapons of our warfare are not *carnal* but *mighty*" (2 Cor. x. 4); and Dr. Goodwin gives a very pertinent illustration from Isaiah xxxi. 3: "The Egyptians are men, and not God; and their horses *flesh*, and not *spirit*." Flesh, we see, is used to denote weakness, and spirit power. The powers, therefore, of a body to be actuated by a life-giving spirit, must be very great.

"Incorruptible," and "immortal," I conceive to be used in this passage as synonymous, the difference consists rather in the process of attainment than in the condition attained, the one referring to *resurrection*, the other to *translation*,—"the dead shall be raised *incorruptible*, and we (who may be alive) shall be changed" (ver. 52), and this change shall be wrought by this mortal putting on "*immortality*," (ver. 54.) It is this which the apostle pre-eminently desires in 2 Cor. v. 4, "that the mortal might be swallowed up of life."

Now, it appears to me not improbable, that the change wrought upon the separate spirit when it puts off the tabernacle, and which gives it a kind of independent existence, is that which will make it a quickening spirit to the glorified body, when reunited.

"Now he who hath wrought us for this very [thing is] God, who also hath given to us the earnest of the Spirit, being therefore always confident," &c.

Here there are two additional arguments for confidence: God himself has wrought us for this end, "we are his workmanship." (Eph. ii. 10.) He has also given the Spirit as a pledge and foretaste.

"He who hath *wrought us*," I apprehend the apostle refers back to chap. iv. 16. God is the agent, afflictions the instrument, renewing the inner man, whilst the outer man is decaying. There is probably an allusion to the fitting of the stones for the Temple.* (1 Kings vi. 7.)

"He who hath wrought us is God." We are thus called upon to consider how great is the Efficient, it is the work of Deity. Sweet thought! If the architect and builder is God, there will not be one

* In the Sept. of 1 Kings vi. 7, the word is the same as here used.

Digitized by Google

blow too many, or one more heavy than necessary, in shaping and fitting the spiritual stones for the Temple.

Again, if the only wise, all-powerful Efficient be "working" a soul to an end, what is to hinder the accomplishment at dissolution, when all the grace in preparation for glory is completed? The "us" thus wrought upon is "the inner man," which is fitted to love and worship God. But the worship which he requires is in accordance with his own nature. (John iv. 23.) Will the inner man be less fitted to perform spiritual worship, when more assimilated to the nature of God?

The apostle speaks of the work as already in part accomplished. "He who *hath* wrought us,"—not who will fit us; this cannot be predicated of the body, which is not wrought upon in a way of glorifying in this life; he speaks of the body as decaying, it is the soul which is now made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light. (Col. i. 12.) The inner man is the immediate object of God's operations, but if so, its fitness for glory does not depend upon its conjunction with the body. Nor must we suppose that it is the desire of glory wrought in us of which this clause of the verse speaks, but it is "us," as wrought and fitted for glory.

St. Paul, in another epistle (Rom. viii. 35), challenges,—Can the sword, i. e., violent death, separate us from the love of Christ, that is, from our love to him; for our being martyrs in his cause could not be a ground of separation from his love to us. Well, but if love cease not to act at death, consciousness and knowledge do not, nor the bliss that attends the exercise of the affections rightly directed. "In death we do more than conquer through him that loved us." (Verse 37.)

The earnest of the Spirit is another argument for confidence; an earnest is a part of the whole; in this it differs from a pledge, which may be of a different nature. Then, as is the earnest, such is the fuller possession. But the Spirit's witnessings are not through the body; we see him not, we hear no audible voice, our bodily organs are not necessary for the reception of his sweet influences; he witnesses directly to "our spirits." (Rom. viii. 16.) Why, then, should our spirits cease to receive the witness of the Spirit, when absent from the body?" I rather believe that the "inexpressible joy" (1 Pet. i. 8), to which a believer may now attain, is but an earnest, a taste of the graciousness of the Lord, which the separate spirit will enjoy.

"Being therefore always confident, and knowing that whilst we are present in the body we are absent from the Lord." (2 Cor. v. 6.)

Boyse says, that verses 6 and 8 do not, in our version, give the force of the original—"We indwelling in the body, dwell forth from the Lord." Professor Scholefield, for the sake of uniformity, renders it, "whilst we are present." But taking either translation, it amounts to this—the one "absent," denotes local separation, the other "present," must indicate local contiguity; some would maintain, that "present with the Lord," means the Lord's presence with us, so making one member of the sentence to imply change of *place* and the other change of *condition*, which appears quite contrary to sound principles of interpretation.

Digitized by Google

There is in this verse:—1. The connecting particle, "therefore." Because God has wrought in us, and because God has given us the earnest of the Spirit. 2. The confidence felt. 3. The constancy, "always." 4. The consciousness, "knowing." 5. The present condition, "present in the body." 6. The consequent loss, "absent from the Lord."

"For we walk by faith, not by sight, but we are confident." (Verse 7.)

Our version of verse 7, seems rather to imply that our not having vision, is the reason why we desire to be absent from the body; perhaps the parenthesis might be extended to "confident" (verse 8), and the sense be this, "Granted that we walk only by faith, nevertheless, we are confident of this blessed condition to come."

"And prefer rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." (2 Cor. v. 8.)

So far from fainting at the thought of the outward man perishing, the apostle preferred it.

"Wherefore we strive, that whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him." (2 Cor. v. 9.)

Because we are confident, and because we desire God's presence, we strive to be well-pleasing unto him; for such "wherefores," see 1 Cor. xv. 58; Heb. xii. 28; Col. i. 10. Perhaps the apostle had the case of Enoch in his mind; Enoch pleased God, and God translated him. (Heb. xi. 5.) We strive to please God, whether translation or dissolution be our portion, being confident the Lord will reward us. The being "present," I understand to be the same as verse 6; "indwelling in the body," and "absent," I suppose is the same as having the earthly house of this tabernacle dissolved. (Ver. 1.)

"For we must all be manifested before the tribunal of Christ, that each may receive the things through the body according to those he has practised, whether good or evil." (2 Cor. v. 10.)

Here, I take rather a different view from what is generally held. The apostle had stated, that what he most desired was, that the mortal should be swallowed up of life,—that his vile body should be changed into a glorious body; but that even dissolution was a state to be preferred greatly beyond the present mortal life. He, however, strove to be well-pleasing to God, because whether in the flesh until, or translated before the Second Advent, we shall all be *manifested* before the tribunal of Christ. And this I do not understand to refer exclusively to the secrets of all hearts being laid open, but also to the manifested bodily condition of the righteous and the wicked. With regard to the righteous, the mortal will be swallowed up of life, whereas, with regard to the wicked, we know, from other passages, that their bodies will not be bodies of glory, but of shame and abhorrence. (Dan. xii. 2; Isa. lxvi. 24.) Hence, I understand the meaning to be, that, as the deeds have been done by the body, as an instrument either of righteousness or unholiness; so shall the recompense be through the body, either of corruption or of glory.

This interpretation seems to me consistent with the following verse. We must not lose the relation between the manifestation mentioned in

Digitized by Google

verse 10, and those of verse 11. We shall *be made manifest* before the tribunal of Christ; we *are made manifest* unto God, and I trust also, *are made manifest* unto your consciences. Now, though the sense would be very good, if we confined the meaning simply to sincerity, for the manifestation in each case would be similar, the apostle could appeal to the heart-searching God, as well as to the consciences of those he addressed, as to his sincerity, which would also hereafter be manifested before the tribunal of Christ; but in this clause, the manifestation of which he speaks, includes *all*, "We must *all* be manifested before the tribunal of Christ." And I do not see why the open, glorious manifestation of the righteous may not also be included, as well as the fearful manifestation of the wicked, which is implied in "knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men." And with this solemn thought I will conclude, in the language of the last of the prophets, "Then shall ye discern between the righteous and the wicked." (Mal. iii. 18.)

Galatians iv. 21—31.

"The bondwoman and the free."

It is sometimes alleged that the use made of "*Jerusalem*," in this passage is sufficient to prove that it may be taken occasionally for *the Christian Church*. It is argued that "*Jerusalem*" is here used as a figure only, and that this example authorizes interpreters of prophecy to explain passages in the Old Testament where Jerusalem occurs as meaning the *Christian Church*, which has succeeded to the place of the Jewish.

Now we think it can easily be shown that in this passage *Jerusalem* is *not* the Christian Church. Some have thought it to be *Jerusalem under Melchizedec*, the earlier or former (ἄνω) Jerusalem. We believe it to be the *New Jerusalem*, the real, literal "*Jerusalem which is above;*" and which is yet to "come down out of heaven from God." And we think this view is capable of strong proof.

Paul is led by the Holy Ghost to refer to an Old Testament narrative, after he has argued the point of *acceptance by grace alone* from facts and statements. He is led to bring forward this allegory as an *illustration* of his argument,—a divinely intended illustration. "As painting," says Luther, "is an ornament to garnish a house already built, so is this allegory to illustrate matter already proved. As the Holy Ghost *intended* the first Adam to be a type of the second, while he was all the while a truly literal and historic personage—as the Holy Ghost *intended* the brazen serpent to be a type of Christ, while it was also a real and true remedy for Israel's present distress—so did he *intend* this remarkable state of things in Abraham's household to be significant of what was to take place in the case of the law and of the Gospel, while the circumstances were literal and true domestic events.

Hagar was an Egyptian,—one of those whose very name suggested bondage to an Israelite,—a black slave bound to obey—possessed of no privileges. *Her son*, Ishmael, was, in character, wild, lawless—the

Digitized by Google

very opposite of Isaac's mildness. On the other hand, *Sarah* was "fair to look upon," her very name signified "princess,"—she was free, and had servants to attend and obey her. Her son *Isaac* grew up mild in character, "meek and lowly," we might say, heir of the inheritance of his father.

Now *Hagar's progeny* had been all of the flesh. There was nothing of the special hand of God in that birth. Nay, Ishmael was born in consequence of Abraham's impatience; he marrying Hagar because the course of nature seemed otherwise likely to leave him childless. But *Sarah's progeny* came entirely as a consequence of God's special blessing. The *promise* was sent that a son should be born to her miraculously. He was a gift to faith; not of the flesh. (Heb. xi. 12; Gen. xvii. 15.)

These two persons, then, resemble the Mosaic dispensation and the Gospel dispensation, (vers. 24, 25.) The Mosaic covenant had its origin at Mount Sinai, and resembles Hagar. The very name "Hadschar," or *Hagar*, means "rock," and was given to *Sinai* by pre-eminence by the Arabians. Both name and nature coincided here to form Hagar's children into a type of those under *the law*. "Jerusalem that now is,"—the Jews still glorying in their Jerusalem Temple,—may be found set forth by this bondwoman; obeying *law* only, and rejecting all else. This Jerusalem begets sons to bondage—"gendereth to bondage"—begets children who are slaves like herself.

But see the contrast! "The *free woman*," "*Jerusalem which is above*," (ver. 26.) It is not said that she "gendereth to freedom," for her family are looked upon as already all born, they being children of *promise*, and therefore sure to appear. This is what we often call "the Church triumphant,"—the Church glorified—but which Scripture calls, "the *heavenly Jerusalem*" (Heb. xii. 22), and "*New Jerusalem*," (Rev. iii. 12; xxi. 2.) This is the "Jerusalem *above*." How does Sarah resemble this? How does the *free woman* resemble "Jerusalem which cometh down from heaven?" Let us inquire.

Sarah, the free woman, is "fair to look upon," and is not New Jerusalem "fair as the moon?" (Song vi. 10.) She is royal—her name שָׂרָה is "princess," and surely they of New Jerusalem are "*kings*"—*a royal* priesthood. She is free—a slave to none—has no servile work to do; she lives in her tent, in ease and plenty. So they of *that Jerusalem*; they live at ease, resting from their labours; and their only service is willing duty, just as Sarah would run and entertain the Son of God when he visited the tent. (Gen. xiv.) Besides, the inheritance belonged to her progeny, and she had got that progeny by believing a promise that at first seemed impossible. And even so did each in that New Jerusalem come thither.

Now, of that heavenly Jerusalem, and of this "free woman," Sarah, believing men are "children." She is "mother of us all"—of all of us who live by faith. We are *her* children; not Hagar's.

It was thus (ver. 27) that Isaiah viewed the matter long ago. For, speaking of the multitudes of both Jews and Gentiles that were to

Digitized by Google

come to the blessed in consequence of Christ's suffering unto death, he was led by the Holy Ghost to write in rapturous strains, (Isa. liv. 1):—

> "Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not,
> Break forth and cry, thou that travailest not;
> For the desolate hath many more children
> Than she that hath an husband."

He had spoken in chapter fifty-three of the Messiah's suffering unto death, of his resurrection, and of his victory, when "he divides a portion with the great:" and now, he suddenly cries aloud with ecstasy at the sight of multitudes, multitudes, drawn to him by his having "been lifted upon the cross." And how does the prophet describe these multitudes? It is as *children of one long barren, children of one that did not bear, children of one that did not travail with child, children of one long desolate.* Is not his language borrowed from Sarah's case? Are not those who come to the Messiah described as children of one who long had no prospect of a progeny? Who is this, then, but "the free woman?" This is Sarah's case. This is the case of her to whom children came after all,—but came not as flesh expected, but by faith.

This "free woman"—this heavenly Jerusalem—is to be replenished by many more children than "the *bond woman*" who "had the husband," or was married, in unbelief, and who had far more of earthly probabilities in her favour. Isaiah tells (liv. 3) of the numbers that shall come to her. "Thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles." It is a promise still waiting for its full accomplishment: but the point of it that bears on Paul's argument is, that it speaks of all who are, or who are yet to be, drawn to that Saviour, as *children of Sarah, children of the long barren free woman.* She is mother of us all! This New Jerusalem family are all her seed.

After all this, the apostle (ver. 28) concludes that we believers are like Isaac. We are not slaves, as Ishmael. But we meet with persecution from Ishmael (ver. 29); and this very fact fills up the likeness we bear to Isaac. As, no doubt, Ishmael mocked at the idea of young Isaac being "father of nations," &c., so do those under the law mock and persecute. (1 John iii. 1.) But let us think of the doom of Hagar's son. He had no portion in the promised inheritance (ver. 30); nay, he is commanded to be "cast out," thrown abroad homeless to the open desert. Alas! how like the doom of those who refuse free grace—"Depart, ye cursed!" We on the other hand, are "heirs" (chap. iii. 29; iv. 7); and if so, cannot be cast out like Hagar's sons, though the world hate us. We are sons of *the free woman*—bound to grace alone. When Hagar's sons are outcast in the wild wilderness—scorched by heat of a wrathful sky, their uneasy steps pressing "the burning marle"—no well of water near —no angel sent to relieve—no pitying Abraham's prayer to follow them; we have our home in New Jerusalem and enter on our inheritance.

———

Digitized by Google

1 Thessalonians v. 5.

"Sons of light and sons of day."

In this passage we are not to understand "*light*" and "*day*" as altogether synonymous. The one refers to the present state of *grace*, the other to the *glory* that follows. In the expression, "*sons of light*," "*υιοι φωτος*," we are called to notice that believers are persons on whom the "day-spring from on high" has shed its beams. They are not any longer in the darkness of sin and in the ignorance of God; they have seen the light; they do not love the darkness; they do not sleep when spiritual things are spoken of; they are not spiritual owls that shun the beams of the Sun of Righteousness. On the contrary, they delight to expose their souls to his shining and bask in his rays. But, after becoming "sons of light," they still see but dimly; they are looking for the dawn becoming noon-day. They are looking onward for the appearing of the time when all remains of darkness shall flee away. This they expect at the Lord's coming; and this is "the day," of which they are "children," or sons. This *day* was mentioned in verse 2, "the day of the Lord," and then in verse 4, "the day," (η ημερα). It was close on the mention of "the day" that the apostle used the expression, "Ye are *sons of the day*," verse 5. Believers, then, are characterized here, as elsewhere in the Bible, by a twofold peculiarity. They are already in the light, and yet they are seeking light more clear and full; they see Christ, and God in him, but they hope to see this light more distinctly soon. They see Christ by faith only, at present; they expect to see Christ by sight, as well as faith, soon. They walk already in "*light*," and so are truly called, "*sons of light*;" but they expect the full flood of light to be poured on them when "*the day*" arrives, and because of this hope which they so fondly cherish, they are called "*sons of day*." In the one view they are already the true "*illuminati*;" but in the other they are only "*illuminandi*."

Reviews.

Thirty-sixth Edition of Dr. Keith's Evidence of Prophecy, with Daguerreotype Views. Edinburgh: William Whyte and Co. 1848.

There is a new feature in this well-known book, that leads us to call the attention of our readers to its pages. This last edition is enriched with the author's personal observations, made on the very scenes of prophecy, and also with plates from Daguerreotype views of some of the most remarkable spots.

We cannot fail to have our confidence in the literality of the still unfulfilled word of prophecy greatly strengthened, by the perusal of such a volume of evidence on the past. We find ourselves reverting to Solomon's

Digitized by Google

words, as he looked round on the finished Temple: "Thou spakest with thy mouth, and hast fulfilled with thine hand, as it is this day." (2 Chron. vi. 15.) Seeing the minute fidelity of the accomplishment hitherto, Solomon inferred as to the future, "Now therefore, O Lord God of Israel, keep with thy servant David my father that which thou hast promised him, saying, There shall not fail thee a man," &c. Have we not been taught by this wisest of men, speaking under inspiration of the Holy Ghost, to conclude that the Lord's fulfilment of the future shall be as strictly to the letter as the past?

There is a remarkable unobtrusiveness in the evidence furnished from this source. The things spoken beforehand are thoroughly brought to pass with calm and quiet certainty. It is come, and it is done, ere ever we are aware that what has been done is the accomplishment of a Divine purpose, predicted ages or years before. We suddenly discover that the position of this ruin, and the very shape of that mound, the kind of stones laid bare, and the occurrence of heaps at that particular spot, there being no cities or villages in this one region, and there being skeletons of many a former town in that other—all is the exact accomplishment of previous prediction. But this has been done so undesignedly by the agents, and the work to be done is now so completely over, that we walk over the spot and wonder. Like the Temple, built without noise of hammers, so this edifice of prophetic evidence is reared in quiet. *Unobtrusiveness* sits on the face of these ruins and lonely vales, on these bare hills and stern rocks. They contain evidence, but they leave you to interrogate them for it. They are in no haste to utter it; they exhibit no trepidation lest you should overlook it. God's witnesses are there, ready to speak for him,—but in no degree alarmed lest their King should suffer loss if their evidence be not presented.

This *unobtrusiveness* in regard to the evidence for the truth of revelation, that lies on the face of Israel's land especially, is quite accordant with the manner in which the face of *nature* presents its evidence for God. There are stupendous heights in the Andes and the Himalayas, which when visited speak forth the awful power and skill of the glorious Creator: yet, for ages on ages, these were unvisited. No haste was made to bring forward their testimony; no herald was sent forth to hurry men to the spot, where such proofs of Godhead-wisdom and might were to be seen. It was left to be discovered by those who in due time might be led thither. There were wonders in the unresolved *nebulæ* of the Milky Way,—it was yet to be seen that there was an assemblage of worlds on worlds. Yet no telegraphic despatch was issued, to call attention in haste to this astounding display of the Creator's immensity. The scene is spread out, and for ages remains unvisited by any telescope. No bustling anxiety is exhibited to bring this testimony forward. *Jehovah* rests in his glory, surrounded by calm witnesses of his attributes, ready to appear, if he see fit, to confound some audacious reptile.

It has been thus with the evidence for God's truth deposited in Israel's land. It has lain there, ready for use, for ages, just as

Digitized by Google

Nineveh has lain underground for ages too. And now it is brought prominently into view, at a period of the world's history which made it peculiarly appropriate. *Infidelity* has stalked over Christendom, and set its mouth against the heavens,—"All things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation," has been its taunt. But Athanasius can unexpectedly produce the living form of him, whose pretended arm his foes exhibit in all the stiffness and cold of death; and the Lord can silently draw out his proof from under the fold of his mantle,—the foretold changes have long existed; the Lord has only to draw aside the veil that was over the observer's eye. *Yonder* is the scene that attests, "*Thou spakest with thy mouth, and hast performed with thy hand.*" He is a God whose words shall come to pass. The tremendous events coming on the earth required, perhaps, such a preface, by way of warning to man. Behold the past! Tremble at the future! "He cometh quickly." "Faithful and true." (Rev. xix. 11.)

To bring forward this species of testimony into fuller view, the Lord has shown his servants how to use that remarkable discovery, the *daguerreotype*. By means of this discovery, the Infidel in the remotest regions may be confronted with the calm, indisputable evidence that has lain ready for centuries on the face of the land of Israel. Dr. Keith has been able to present engravings of many of the daguerreotype views, so accurate and distinct, that, if you find any difficulty in deciding what this or that object is, you have only to apply a glass to the eye, and the object is magnified to your view in all its real properties, exactly as when seen on the spot.

But may we not allege, that this copiousness of evidence on the subject of the literal fulfilment of the prophetic word in times past has been brought before us in present times, in order to accomplish the further end of convincing Christian men themselves, that they cannot be wrong in expecting *literality* in the fulfilment of the future? Has not the *daguerreotype* also lent its help to this same end? When we gaze on one of these engraved daguerreotypes, presented to us by Dr. Keith in this volume, we feel how minutely literal past fulfilments have been. We gaze on Ashdod, and descry "*the cottages for shepherds, and folds for flocks;*" or stand at Tyre, and become witnesses, cognisant ourselves of the fact, that it has become "*a place for the spreading of nets,*"—or take up in our very hands undeniable evidence that Ashkelon is "without *inhabitant,*" "*a desolation.*"

We quite agree with the following remarks of the author, regarding the supposed accomplishment of predictions, of which the Word had not intimated the precise period. The haste of men to find *everything* fulfilled *at once*, misled them, and helped to suggest the system of *spiritualizing*:—

"When a scriptural command, in reference to a prophetic *vision*, was disregarded, and men would not *wait for it*, while it *tarried* till the *appointed time*, when, *as made plain upon tables*, it should *speak and not lie*, a symbolical significancy could alone be attached in ancient times to the judgments on Edom, and the proudest of its cities, when Aretas reigned in 'his palace at Petra,' or when that city was the capital of a Roman province, or a metropolitan see in Christian times. Jerome, for example, could not see this vision as the

Digitized by Google

prophet saw it, while the inhabitants of Edom, as he testifies, continued to dwell in excavated habitations, or in the cliffs of the rocks. It was too early then for the expositor to see those things which the prophets had written, and not reading those predictions literally, Christian writers readily interpreted them after the manner of the Jewish, substituting the enemies of the Church for the enemies of Israel, as symbolized by Edom, or the Edomites. And it ought not, we apprehend, to be deemed late enough now to sanction the averment, that these prophecies were fulfilled 2000 years ago, while yet Idumea was a kingdom, and the Edomites a people. In either way, as in any other, *the word of God is not bound.* Judgments indeed fell, or began to fall on Edom in times anterior to that era; others rest upon it still, as it now speaks for itself; and it has yet to bear witness to other prophecies. The distinction has to be drawn, not only between figurative and literal predictions, of which the latter have been trenching greatly on the former, as men would construe them, —but also between accomplished and unaccomplished prophecies, that the former be not made to occupy the place of the latter, as men, we are free to confess, are yet prone to err." (Pp. 315, 316.)

Dr. Keith has been led, by the irresistible force of the past, to expect nothing less than literality, even where others might imagine a necessity for something more abstract and loose. Speaking of *Bozrah* as having a place in "the unfulfilled, as well as in the accomplished prophecies," (p. 359), he proceeds to remark:—

"Some have supposed it to be Bozrah of the Hauran, but the lands both of Moab and Ammon lay between that city and Mount Seir. The Bozrah of Edom seems, with incomparably greater propriety, to be identified with *Beszeyrah*, of which the ruins show that it was, 'in ancient times, a considerable city.' Of late years, a tower was built there by the Arab hordes; that after the erection of which, the inhabitants of Omeda, now a ruined village, three or four hours to the north of it, removed to *Beszeyrah*, which was a village of about fifty houses, when visited by Burckhardt. It thus exists, or existed again as an inhabited place. And mean as it may seem, it is still said of Bozrah, in the book of the Lord, in reference to *the treading of the winepress*, the day of vengeance, *the year of his redeemed*,—'Who is this that cometh from *Edom*, with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his might? I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save.' The day will declare it. But, as thus it is written, though not thus alone, the time may not yet be past in which men shall say,—*The Lord will be magnified from the border of Edom.* But the illustration of such prophecies pertains to another theme, as they point to another time."

Babylon may afford an illustration of the manner in which apparently contradictory predictions may both be fulfilled in the end. In pp. 466 and 470, we read:—

"'*Babylon shall be pools of water.*' While the workmen '*cast her up as heaps*,' in piling up the rubbish, while excavating for bricks, that they may *take* them *from thence*, and that '*nothing may be left*,' they labour more than trebly in the fulfilment of prophecy. For the numerous and deep excavations form '*pools of water*' on the overflowing of the Euphrates; and annually filled, they are not dried up throughout the year."

"'*The sea is come upon Babylon, she is covered with the multitude of the waves thereof.*' The traces of the western bank of the Euphrates are now no longer discernible. The river overflows unrestrained; the very ruins, with every appearance of the embankment, have been swept away. 'The ground there is low and marshy, and presents not the slightest vestige of former buildings of any description whatever.' Morasses and ponds track the ground in various parts. 'For a long time after the general subsiding of the Euphrates, great

Digitized by Google

part of this plain is little better than a swamp,' &c. 'The ruins of Babylon are then inundated, so as to render many parts of them inaccessible, by converting the valley among them into morasses.'"

The beautifully simple manner in which the providence of Jehovah has guided the fall of a tower, to fulfil a prediction, may suggest how in the future, the same hand of skill and power may bring about greater things by as simple means. It is written: "*The forts and towers* shall be for *dens.*" (Isa. xxxii. 14):—

"In unconscious confirmation of the prophecy, Volney testifies that 'every step we meet with ruins of *towers*, dungeons, and castles, with fosses, frequently *inhabited by jackals*, *owls*, and *scorpions.*' Where towers have fallen, the arches on which they were built remain, and, like natural cavities in a rock, they are now *for dens.* And, where they still stand, as in many deserted cities east of the Jordan, they are open to wild beasts, and serve them for shade or for shelter, when they have *ceased* to be the defences of *habitations now forsaken* by men." (P. 142.)

Parallel to this, in respect of simple means, is the statement regarding the disappearance of trees from the land. (P. 182):—

"Close by the sources of the Jordan, as they gush copiously from the ground, amidst all but impenetrable thickets of brambles and other thorny plants, which a little art would convert into heaps of brushwood, the writer measured a magnificent oak, upwards of fifteen feet in circumference, which was burned close to the ground to the depth of three feet and a-half, or nearly from side to side, and hence, though containing solid wood enough to floor a mansion, was fast withering away, that its branches might be broken off to form *fires* for worse than Goths, who had no sense to convert the noble tree to any better use, nor ingenuity to form an axe to fell it, nor *understanding* or taste to spare the finest oak that shaded the fountain of Jordan; while, in strange contrast, they let alone the *briars* that flourish luxuriantly on the site of Dan, and that were to come upon the cities of Israel. In the north of Syria we saw thousands of pines that had been burnt at the root, whose large and once lofty stems, that would well have formed masts for many navies, were rotting on the ground, after the *branches* had been *broken off.* Causes are thus visible at this day, which, though originating in ignorance, as well as in the ravages of contending factions and secret mischief, solve the mystery of bare and desolated plains, where even fruit-trees were proverbial for their abundance. Judea, in the days of Josephus, had abundance of trees, and was full of autumnal fruit. But now, with very limited exceptions, its hills are bare, and branches are broken off where trees are not suffered to grew to any height. On his first visit to Jerusalem, the author, seeing several women carrying on their heads loads of branches into that city, where Solomon made cedars like the sycamores in the valley for abundance, was informed, on questioning his friend, Mr. Nicolayson, that such, except for ovens, was the only fuel. On his second visit, on the way from Jerusalem to Hebron, he met two women with loads of firewood, burnt at the ends and withered, who were followed by two men with four asses similarly laden; and he passed in some places many bushes of the evergreen oak, several of the largest of which—the earliest prey—had been burnt at the root, and the wood carried away; and the region that, with partial exceptions, was stripped of its covering, seemed to be spreading farther and farther from Jerusalem, as from other villages in the land not desolated by the Bedouins."

This volume contains a considerable amount of evidence quite original. We give an extract of this kind, because of its interest and value, as well as because its information is entirely new. The prophecy regarding *Hazor* runs thus in Jeremiah xlix. 33:—"*Hazor shall be a dwelling for dragons, and a desolation for ever: there shall*

Digitized by Google

no man abide there, nor any son of man dwell in it." And here is its present condition as explored by Dr. Keith. The name *Hazor* is well known in the vicinity; there are ruins so called, and a wall, and a hill. Ascending from the waters of Meron to Pareas, you turn a little aside to arrive at the spot:—

"The name remains, but the city is no more; and, literally, as the word of the Lord revealed the existing fact, though long unknown in other lands, *no man abides there, nor does a son of man dwell in it.* Its site is nearly midway between one poor village and another, that are about eight or nine miles apart. The fountain of Hazor now waters only a tomb. The city that was the *head of kingdoms* is a *desolation*, and now can only vie with the most complete ruins. Habitations for men there are none: and no man there occupies the poorest hovel, such as often rest on other ruins. Those of Hazor consist of the foundations of buildings and heaps of stones, spread over a considerable space, lying loosely together, and, in some places, thrown up into long lines, or dykes, full of holes, into which any reptiles may creep. Lizards may be seen everywhere in great numbers throughout the land. And purposely guarding against a leading question, and without speaking of serpents, the writer asked an old man, who left his flock at a short distance and came to him amidst the heaps, whether he ever saw any lizards running into the holes. He answered in the affirmative, and, of his own accord, added that there were many serpents also, of which he mentioned three different kinds, of one of which the bite is death. He affirmed that he had himself seen some large serpents; and, when asked if he had seen any as large as a stick which the author had in his hand, he held up his own wand, six feet in length, and said that he had seen some larger than it. He persisted in the assertion that there were many serpents that had their holes in the ruins; but, when questioned, as a test of his veracity, about other animals, he stated, with seeming candour, that he had never seen any scorpions there. It is now obvious to any one who beholds them, that the stones of Hazor now lie as if placed and fitted for being—what that city was to become, a *dwelling for serpents.*

"'*No man shall abide there, neither shall a son of man dwell in it.*'

"Not a human habitation is near it, and, situated as it is on the lower skirts of Hermon, the Bedouins do not there pitch their tents, as in the plains. No natural cause could be assigned for the completion of this wondrous prediction. The site was well fitted for the capital of Canaan; and the 'host of Hazor,' of which Sisera was the captain, has no mean place in scriptural history. In the approach to it from Paneas, we repeatedly plucked, while seated on horseback, the flowers of myrtles, which, in their great abundance, perfumed the air, and woodbines, mint, thyme, hollies, and oleanders added to its fragrance, or adorned the wilderness. Near to the ruins, and not in the bottom of a valley, but on the top of a hill, are stately oaks that would add to the grandeur of any park in England, four of which we measured from eleven feet and a-half to upwards of thirteen feet in circumference—the branches of one of them extending seventy-four feet from the opposite extremities. The heights of Jebel Hazour are for the most part covered with thorns, and trees or bushes of the *quercus ilex* (oak) interspersed with roses, many prickly plants, varieties of thistles—one of them, together with a species of very high broom, distinguished by its beautiful yellow flowers. These, with some partial cultivation, shew how plentifully industry might there reap its reward in the environs of a city now itself a desolation. But while many citizens of modern towns court in other lands the shade of humbler trees, and are often crowded beneath them, there is not one inhabitant of that city now to rest under the lofty and umbrageous oaks of Hazor, or to drive a wolf from the fountain, or a serpent from its dwelling. There are other cities in the land once subject to that head of the kingdom that still have men to dwell in them, the city that went out by a thousand may still have a hundred left, and that which went out by a hundred may count ten. Paneas, often taken and often demolished, has yet its twenty houses and its hundred

Digitized by Google

inhabitants, and a large village still subsists on the nearest border of the marshy and pestiferous plain of Houle. But the doomed capital of Canaan, though rebuilt by Solomon, with its fountain still flowing pure as ever, its shady oaks, its rich and partly cultivated soil, and its pure air, perfumed with the scent of Lebanon, *is a desolation, a dwelling of serpents*, and not of a single human being. *No man abideth there, neither does a son of man dwell in it.*"

There is no hyperbole in the statements of the sure word of prophecy—no looseness—no dashing off a subject with unmeaning flourishes. All is substance; every syllable has its significance. No man can read this volume, with its manifold and varied details, without rising from the perusal, convinced of the stern fidelity that characterizes the delineations of God's Word regarding things now past, and scarcely less impressed with the feeling that the future scenes, foretold but still incomplete, shall certainly appear in all their exactness of detail. There are sketches of blessedness for earth which the soul of a renewed man longs to see, and sketches of gladness which even a natural man can anticipate with rapture. And there are prospective woes that spread an awe over the spirit, the more oppressive as they become more evidently near. Yet a little while, and the universe shall know that "*He that believeth shall be saved.*" Yet a little while, and the universe shall see that "*He that believeth not shall be damned.*" The glory of New Jerusalem and the Smoke of Torment shall be as visible as are now the scenes of Israel's land. Yet a little while, and the universe shall know that not Rome, but Jerusalem, is the "*eternal city,*" and that not Antichrist, but *Christ*, is the *Prince of the kings of the earth.*

The First and Second Advent; with a View of the Millennium. By JAMES CARLILE, D.D., of St. Mary's, Dublin. Johnstone, Edinburgh.

DR. CARLILE is a post-Millennialist, and, in the course of this little work, presents us with some of his reasons for being so, and his objections against our interpretations of Scripture. He writes calmly and simply: but he seems to entertain a very great dislike to pre-Millennialism, as "endangering the whole fabric of Christianity." He does not enter upon any adduction of evidence to shew in what this danger consists, or how it arises. We can only meet it with a counter-affirmation to the effect that it is *his* system, not *ours*, that is "endangering the whole fabric of Christianity," by the *non-natural* sense which it affixes to Scripture—the spiritualizing, or *Platonizing*, or *Origenizing* process to which it subjects its plainest passages,—the refusal to concede literality to the prophecies regarding Christ's second coming, while maintaining against Jews and Unitarians the strict and proper literality of all the predictions respecting his first coming.

It is rather interesting to know that those who have not only "endangered the whole fabric of Christianity," but subverted it, have not been Millenarians, but their opponents. The Gnosticism of the early ages, begun by Simon Magus, and perfected by Valentinus, was essentially anti-Millenarian, anti-literal, allegorical. It not only

Digitized by Google

allegorized into spiritual shadows the *first* resurrection, but all resurrection whatsoever. And who upheld the truth of God against these anti-Millenarian allegorizers? Irenæus and Justin Martyr—two noted Millenarians! The heretic Gnostics were the only opposers of Millenarianism in the early ages, and the thoroughly orthodox fathers were its unanimous supporters. Gnosticism and anti-Chiliasm were friends; Chiliasm and Gnosticism were resolute enemies in that age. Yet it is said that our system "endangers the whole fabric of Christianity." *

Origen and Jerome were both keen anti-Chiliasts, yet from which of them could any one learn anything of sound doctrine? They were both thoroughly heterodox on fundamental points, neither of them having any idea of free grace or justification by faith. Yet it is said that Chiliasm "endangers the whole fabric of Christianity." We admit that Augustine was much sounder than either of these two; but he stood alone in his soundness. Up till his day, Chiliasm and orthodoxy went together; anti-Chiliasm and heterodoxy were brethren. It is singular, also, to notice that the first opposers of Chiliasm set out with denying the inspiration of the Apocalypse! They felt that very passage which Dr. Carlile spiritualizes to be too strong and plain for them. They felt that they could not deny Chiliasm without getting rid of the Apocalypse. "It is worthy of remark (says Bishop Russell—no Chiliast) that so long as the prophecies respecting the Millennium were interpreted literally, the Apocalypse was received as an inspired production, and as the work of the Apostle John; but no sooner did theologians find themselves compelled to view its annunciations through the medium of allegory and metaphorical description, than they ventured to call in question its heavenly origin, its genuineness, and its authority. . *Dionysius, the great supporter of the allegorical school, gives a decided opinion against the authenticity of the Revelation!!!*" * Yet it is said that Chiliasm "endangers the whole fabric of Christianity."

In after-ages we find *Popery* issuing its authoritative condemnation of Chiliasm, both in its systems of theology and in its histories; and, until the days of Juan Josephat Ben Ezra, we never heard of a single Papist being a Chiliast. Popery and Chiliasm have always been enemies to each other. Popery has always been anti-Chiliastic. Yet it is said that Chiliasm "endangers the whole fabric of Christianity."

Since the Reformation, the same alliance of orthodoxy with Chiliasm and the converse may be traced out. We are quite aware of instances to the contrary, but this is the general rule. Arianism, Socinianism, Rationalism, Arminianism, Pelagianism, have almost invariably taken the *anti-Chiliastic* side. Chiliasm has invariably

* "Chiliasm constituted in the second century so decidedly an article of faith, that Justin held it up as a criterion of perfect orthodoxy."—SEMISCH's *Justin Martyr*, vol. ii., p. 365. *Cerinthianism* and *Chiliasm* are sometimes in our day set down as synonymous. Strange, when the Chiliastic fathers were the strongest opponents of Cerinthianism!

† "Discourses," pp. 87, 88.

Digitized by Google

shewn the strongest affinity to Calvinism.* In the last century, the champion of anti-Chiliasm was Whitby, and he was an Arminian. Since then the Rationalism of Germany and the Arminianism of England and Scotland have condemned and ridiculed Chiliasm as a fable. Dead Churches have always been anti-Chiliastic; when life came in, Chiliasm arose. Some of the soundest and most eminent divines of the Westminster Assembly were "express Chiliasts," and even the Fifth-Monarchy men of that day, with whose faults Chiliasm has been often reproached, were all sound in doctrine, as their writings testify.

Of late, two of the bitterest opponents of Chiliasm are Moses Stuart, of Andover, who has gone strange lengths in Rationalism, and Dr. Bush, of New York, who has turned Swedenborgian!! Yet it is said that Chiliasm "endangers the whole fabric of Christianity." How truly the opposite of this might be affirmed! If all ecclesiastical history be not a fable, there is no heresy from Gnosticism, Popery, and Socinianism, upwards, that has not been *intimately* associated with anti-Chiliasm. And though we do not deny that Chiliasts have fallen into sad errors (witness Tertullian and Edward Irving), yet it is with soundness in the faith that Chiliasm has been all along associated, and its chief opponents in time past have been Heretics, Papists, Socinians, Rationalists, and Pelagians!

Dr. Carlile affirms that,—

"The only passage in Scripture on which the expectation of a Millennium, or thousand years of spiritual prosperity, is founded is in Rev. xx. 1—6."

And adds again, in another paragraph, that,—

"It is very extraordinary that round this solitary symbolical announcement of a thousand years, during which Satan is to be bound in the bottomless pit, have been congregated almost every promise of external glory contained either in the Old or New Testament, and a period of blessedness has thus been held up during the present transitory, imperfect, sinful state of man, which has, to a fearful extent, been made to obscure the great promise to which the faith of the Church has been directed in all ages, and on which the hope of every individual member of the Church rests; namely, the eternal separation of the righteous from the wicked, the destruction of Satan, the abolition of death, and the everlasting peace and joy of all God's people in the presence of God, and the restitution of all things;—all to be effected by the second coming of Christ to judgment."

We hardly know what to reply to this passage; for it condemns anti-Millenarians as well as ourselves, seeing the most of them do (just what we do, though spirtualizing the passages), congregate around this solitary symbolical announcement almost every promise, &c. We are at a loss to discover the evil of so doing, and Dr. C. does not tell us. And as to the fearful obscuration of the promise, we are equally at a loss, and must continue so till further explanation is given.

* It is curious to notice in a Tract, published by a Wesleyan local preacher, that one of the objections to Millenarianism which he combats is, "that they who hold these views are Calvinists!" He tries to shew that *some* Millenarians have been Arminians, but can only number two. He admits the *fact* that the great mass of Millenarians are Calvinists. Yet Dr. C. thinks they "endanger the whole fabric of Christianity."

Digitized by Google

Further, we do not understand why we should be so often taunted with having only one passage on which our system rests. This is not the case. We produce hundreds. But even were there only one passage, is not that enough, if it be the word of the living God?

1. Dr. C. affirms that these millennial events, described in the twentieth chapter, must be before the second coming of the Lord. We affirm the contrary, and point to the preceding chapter as indicating the pre-millennialism of the Advent. He cites no Scripture to prove his statement, but argues that it *cannot* be otherwise, adding the following remark, which we do not understand:—

"The events symbolized in this prophecy belong to our present imperfect condition, and *therefore* (?) they *cannot* be propounded as promises, that is as objects of faith."

2. Dr. C. gives the following statement as to symbols and their interpretation,—the meaning of which we take it to be that the details of symbol are unintelligible, or nearly so:—

"The essential characters of the events pointed at in these symbols, their being good or evil are sufficiently distinct; but when an attempt is made by means of the symbols, *to ascertain more exactly* what, and where, and when, and how the events will be, then the symbols must be interpreted, and the interpretation of every one of them requires research, and *is involved in doubt and uncertainty.* And it does appear to me to be rash and hazardous in the extreme to involve the very essentials of Christianity, the very cardinal points of its doctrine, in the obscurity and uncertainty of such inquiries. (Who does this,—or in what way does the interpretation of symbols involve such sad results?) Keep these symbolical prophecies apart from the plain declarations of Scripture presented to our faith (are the symbolical declarations not presented to our faith? To what then?) and the revelation of God's purposes is clear as light,—a child may understand and believe it; intermingle these prophecies with the plain declarations of Scripture (what does this mean?) and the whole *instantly becomes vague, indistinct, and dubious!*"

When we interpret a symbol or translate it into plain language we *must* of course mingle it with the plain declarations of God's Word;—not only we millennarians, but every body else,—and what Dr. C. can mean by this sentence, save to deter everybody from meddling with the symbols, we cannot see. It seems to us a strange statement,—an unscriptural sentiment.

3. If nothing is said about Christ's coming, in this vision, it is because all was said in the previous chapter, which was needful to show that Christ's coming must have already taken place. That preceding chapter, with its terrific description of "fierceness and wrath," of slaughter, bloodshed, havoc, massacre, fire, destruction,—the invitation to the fowls of heaven to eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and the flesh of all men, free and bond, small and great,—the casting the enemies of Christ into a lake of fire burning with brimstone, slaying the remnant with the sword and filling the fowls with their flesh,—all this means the diffusion of the blessings of the Gospel!! We give his own words:—

"The armies of heaven seem to point at the messengers of Christ, the preachers of his Gospel, the soldiers of the cross; and it is also *confirmed* (!) by

Digitized by Google

the sharp sword, that is, the Word of God, going out of his mouth, and by other parts of the description ; *so that we are probably to understand by it a wide diffusion of the Gospel by the ordinary means,* but with extraordinary power of the Spirit, *previous to the binding of Satan.*"

This seems strange to us. It is interpreting symbols by their contraries,—making darkness mean light, war peace, death life, sorrow joy, and destruction salvation. Yet unless we are prepared to believe all this we are to be charged with making all "vague, indistinct, and dubious," nay, with "endangering the whole fabric of Christianity."

4. On Dr. C.'s fourth paragraph we would simply remark, that we do not believe that the mere withdrawal of Satanic influence and leaving men "simply under the influence of their own natural alienation from God," would be followed "probably by a more cordial and extensive reception of the Gospel than has ever yet been witnessed." Man's heart, even without Satan, will, unless wrought upon by the Spirit, reject the Gospel. Dr. C.'s statement is an unguarded one, making no reference to the Spirit's work at all.

5. Dr. C. asserts that the passage only speaks of the "reviving of souls or spirits, not of bodies." How *ψυχη* can be the same as *πνευμα*, as Dr. C. *says* it is, we do not see. He cannot produce a single instance to prove the statement. Until this is done, we are content to affirm with all lexicographers and translators, that *ψυχη* does not mean *πνευμα*, but something entirely different. Then as to there being no mention of bodies,—how often does *ψυχη* mean *person*, not soul alone, —nay, how often does it mean *body* even without soul or spirit? When, for instance, the Apostle Paul says, "let every *soul* (*ψυχη*) be subject to the higher powers," does he exclude bodies? Would Dr. C. say he speaks only of "souls or spirits, not bodies," being subject to the higher powers? Where we read in Acts (xxvii. 37), there were in the ship "threescore and sixteen *souls*," does this mean that there were no *bodies?* But every Greek scholar, nay, every reader of his Bible can furnish himself with many similar instances. That *ψυχη* also means *bodies* may easily be shown from the Septuagint. *Biel*, in his "*Thesaurus Philologicus*," gives, as one of the meanings of the word,—*homo, animal, corpus exanime, cadaver*, producing several explicit passages, such as *ἐπὶ πάσῃ ψυχῇ τετελευτηκυτᾳ οὐκ εἰσελευσεται.** Would it not have been well if Dr. C. had considered these points before venturing on such assertions?

On the other parts of Dr. C.'s statements, regarding the resurrection and the "rest of the dead," we do not enter. They present nothing in the shape of argument. They are mere statements of opinions, and as such we leave them to their own weight. Dr. C. asks,—

* Even Moses Stuart is compelled to admit the literality of the resurrection here. "They revived, or came to life, *i. e.*, returned to a life like the former one, viz., a union of soul and body. So does the word mean in Rev. i. 8, 13, 14, and in many other passages. Any other exegesis here would seem to be incongruous. . . . . There would seem to remain only one meaning which can be consistently given to ἔζησαν, that they, the martyrs who renounced the beast, are now restored to life, viz., such life as implies the vivification of the body."—*Comment. on the Apoc.*, vol. ii. pp. 359, 360.

Digitized by Google

"Is it probable, is it possible, is it conceivable, that Christ personally, with his risen saints, is to be literally besieged and assailed with warlike weapons in Jerusalem?"

We answer, No. It is very improbable; but worse than that, it is unscriptural. We are not acquainted with any one who believes it.

Dr. C. affords another instance out of the many, to show how irreconcileably at variance with each other all anti-millennarians are. Each has a different hypothesis, a different system, a different interpretation. They often upbraid us with our differences. But our differences are not a tithe of theirs. Of this passage alone we could collect at least a dozen of anti-millennarian interpretations,—each at war with the other, and only agreed in resolving to maintain that the millennarian exposition *cannot* be the true one, and that *it* must be disproved at all hazards.

But it is not only on this passage that they differ. On almost every other similar one, nay, in their general system, they are at strange variance with each other. Each author maintains something new, something conflicting with all the rest, and whilst *we* have at least some fixed points on which we accord, differing in many details, they have scarce one point of agreement save their hostility to us.

It is Written; or, every Word and Expression contained in the Scriptures proved to be from God. By Professor L. Gaussen. London: Bagster and Sons. 1847.

Any one whose "delight is in the law of the Lord," will prize this work greatly. It is the work of a scholar no less than of a Christian, —a work much needed in these times, when very loose ideas of inspiration are afloat, some taking from, and others adding to, the Word of God. We cite two passages, not so much as specimens of the volume, as because of their bearing upon the subject of the Advent:—

"We may judge, by what has been accomplished of the glory of the light which will be shed on the Scriptures at the second coming of Jesus Christ. Observe what vivid brightness was cast upon all parts of the Old Testament at the first appearing of the Son of God, and learn from this what will be the radiance of the two Testaments at his second Advent. Then the plan of God will be consummated; then will our Lord and King, fairer than the children of men, borne on the word of truth, meekness, and righteousness, be revealed from heaven; then will his light fill the hearts of his ransomed ones, and the imposing grandeur of the work of redemption, will be exhibited in all its glory to the gaze of the children of God."—Pp. 305, 306.

"These saints, a sample of what all ought to be, were so penetrated with the hope of the appearing of the Lord, that they thought not of dying before that event, for the apostle had said, 'We who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord,' &c. And in his Second Epistle he comforts them upon assembling to Christ before the day of wrath sets in on the world. (2 Thess. ii.) Well! were they deceived? or are people now wiser who identify the coming of the Lord, not with the resurrection and translation of the just, but with death? How often have we heard the mystical parables of our Lord interpreted of mortality with all gravity, as if there was any connexion between a deathbed scene and a marriage feast. But the coming of Christ is to the Spirit ever nigh; and the Spirit dwells in the saints. The Spirit and the bride say, Come; and

Digitized by Google

Jesus himself testifies, 'surely I come quickly.' Hence, the more spiritual we are, that is, the more we live in spirit with him who is at the right hand of God, (for 'He hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus,') the more are we enabled to form the Lord's own estimate of time (2 Pet. iii. 8), not looking at it chronologically but morally, and are prepared to meet the Lord at any moment. Hence to the Thessalonians, St. Paul, St. John, and all others who have immediately expected the Lord, time was not as we reckon it by selfish and human calculation, but the Church, as our Lord foretold, has been thus reckoning. The evil servant has said in his heart, 'My Lord delayeth his coming;' and both the foolish and wise virgins have slept (Matt. xxiv. xxv.); worldliness and assumption, eating and drinking, and smiting the fellow-servants have accordingly followed. And 'Behold he cometh,' is up to this moment as a vision, thwarting the happy dream of the conversion of the world. Alas! poor Church, meditating the conversion of the world instead of considering whence thou art fallen, and strengthening that which remains, blinded to thy true condition before God."—P. 152.

Horæ Biblicæ Sabbaticæ; Sabbath Scripture Readings. By the late THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., LL.D. Two vols. Edinburgh. 1848.

THESE two volumes are more devotional than expository,—more practical than exegetical. They are intensely interesting, as laying open the whole heart of that great man, to whom the whole Church of Christ owes so much, and whose memory will long be fragrant in the earth. The outpourings of his soul before God,—the unbosoming of all his secret thoughts and feelings to his heavenly Father are most truly touching: his intense earnestness in pressing on after God, his unwearied and single-eyed zeal in the cause of Christ, are most stirring and quickening to the reader. No one will rise from the perusal of these volumes without a higher appreciation of the moral and spiritual character of this man of God. Our extracts, however, must be brief, and bearing upon prophecy. Without expressing any opinion in reference to the *reign* of Christ, he makes frequent reference to His *coming*:—

"Above all, let us wait for the coming of the Son of man; and let my constant attitude be that of one who looketh for the Saviour."—Vol. i., p. 108.

"Meanwhile let us wait for the coming of our Lord, who will destroy all adversaries, and will dissipate every darkening influence by the brightness of his appearance. I desire to cherish a more habitual and practical faith than heretofore, in that coming which even the first Christians were called to hope for with all earnestness, even though many centuries were to elapse ere the hope could be realized; and how much more we who are so much nearer to this great fulfilment than at the time when they believed."—P. 311.

"What can be the city here spoken of? It is much liker London than Rome—a commercial than a mere ecclesiastical capital.—Is not this heart of mine a cage of every unclean and hateful bird? Let them be cast out of me, O Lord. But where is my resolution, where the systematic effort and aim at sanctification? Enable me to keep this heart with all diligence—seeing that out of it are the issues of life. Let me know, O God, when to apply the injunction of 'Come out from the companionships of evil, lest I be partaker of their sins.' A book of remembrance is kept by God, and when the account is risen to a certain height, then comes the reckoning, and it will indeed be an awful one. The lamentation of the kings for Babylon points more to the ecclesiastical capital of their monarchies, whereas the description of her wealth and merchan-

Digitized by Google

dise points greatly more to our own London; that may, however, be involved in the corruptions of Popery ere this fearful drama is consummated. The lamentation of the sailors points more to a place of great shipping interest than to Rome, or any place in Italy, and strengthens the argument for its being the capital of our own land. We cannot perceive that shipowners are much enriched by the traffic of Rome; and the lamentation seems far more applicable to London, lapsed, it may be, when the period of his fulfilment comes round, into Antichristianism. The merchants of our land are far more the great men of the earth than those of any other nation—though the deception of all nations by sorceries and the shedding of the blood of saints, and the dealing in the souls of men, are as yet greatly more applicable to Rome, of which Babylon seems to be here spoken as the representative and the type. In the uncertainty of what is prophetical in this chapter, let me not overlook the moral which obviously runs through it—the certainty of God's judgments on the wicked, and of the chastisements which He deals out collectively and nationally to corrupt societies of men. Let me shun all such societies, and keep myself pure in the midst of every surrounding contamination."—P. 428.

Lessons for the Present from the Records of the Past; or, Practical and Experimental Thoughts on Genesis. By the Rev. R. MACDONALD, Blairgowrie. Edinburgh: W. P. Kennedy, 1848.

THIS work, as the title indicates, is of an exclusively practical and experimental character. The author does not profess to give an "enlarged or systematic exposition" of Genesis. His object is not to direct or aid the inquiries of *the student* as to the exact meaning of the sacred text, but to guide the devout meditations of *the believer*, and generally to advance the interests of Christ in the hearts of men. Leaving therefore to others the province of direct, elaborate, abstract exposition, he, in a series of rapid and succinct, yet frequent and suggestive comments, seeks to bring the truth into close and immediate contact with the heart. Considered in relation to the object which it aims at, his work is skilfully executed, and we recommend it to our readers as one, which we think fitted to administer help, comfort, and edification in the Divine life. He exhibits encouragement at once to the exercise of faith, and the practice of holiness, nor, when the opportunity is offered, does it fail to hold forth the proper objects of the Church's hope. The transitions are such as indicate a meditative cast of mind, and a spiritual bent of the affections. In some instances they are abrupt, but, perhaps, in no instance will they appear forced or unnatural, at least to any one who has himself acquired, or can appreciate in others, the happy art of associating every object with Christ, or with things of a spiritual nature. The structure of the sentence is frequently antithetical, and so fitted to give the truth a faster hold of the memory. The diction is unpretending, easy, and elegant. It bears on its character a deep impression of sincerity and earnestness. Like a transparent medium, it shows clearly at once the mind and the heart of the author.

The spirit and character of the work will be best illustrated by giving a few quotations:—

"Man's residence was prepared before he himself was created. His opening eyes at once beheld a world as richly furnished, as it was exquisitely finished.

Digitized by Google

So shall it be in paradise restored. The 'many mansions' shall be all ready, for the 'many sons' Christ is leading into glory."—Page 13.

"But for the deep sleep and opened side of Adam, there would have been no living Eve. So but for the far deeper sleep and pierced side of Christ, there would have been no ransomed Church,—'the Lamb's wife.' His death is our life."—Page 15.

"It rained on the earth forty days. Only he that can number the sands of the sea-shore, can tell the drops which there fell, and yet there was *a curse* in every one of them. How easily can God curse our blessings, and turn the refreshing shower into a destroying flood!"—Page 57.

"'The iniquity of the Amorites was *not yet full.*' How rich is God's forbearance! He is slow to strike, even when the provocation is great. Human guilt often cries long and loud, before Divine vengeance is inflicted.

"What was *a promised good* to the Israelites was *a threatened evil* to the Canaanites; the former could not enter in till the latter were cast: hence the same delay, that prepared the one for the blessing, ripened the other for the curse."—Page 118.

"When Rebekah was asked, 'Wilt thou go with this man?' she unhesitatingly answered, '*I will go?*' Did we more unreservedly give ourselves unto the Lord, with what a willing heart and joyful step would we go forth to meet *the Bridegroom.*"—Page 205.

"Jacob was, like all his fathers, a stranger in the land, and, unless we are strangers, it will be so with us also. He, that seeks *a house* in this world, will find no home in the next. The believer's only home, while in the wilderness, is the bosom of his God."—Page 326.

From the following quotations the intelligent reader will perceive that Mr. Macdonald rejoices in the hope of the Lord's premillennial advent:—

"If we are really united to Christ, it matters little where we breathe our last, or our bones are laid,—and here more than ever, for the home is near, when all the sleeping saints shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall come forth, —to die, to sin, to sorrow, no more for ever. The night, blessed be God, is *far spent*, and the day is *at hand.*"—Page 426.

"No tongue can tell, or mind conceive, what Jesus has laid up for them that love him. Our frames, now so weak and weary, shall yet be fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body; our souls, now so stained and polluted, shall yet be 'without spot or blemish, or any such thing;' our cross shall be exchanged for a crown, and our pilgrim's staff for a palm of victory."—Page 466.

"While we have a Saviour already *come* to look to in faith, we have also a Saviour *coming* to look for in hope. Christ crucified in the past, must never be dissociated in our minds from Christ glorified in the future,—the command being, 'Ye do show the Lord's death *till* he come.' Believer, seek to realize, in this matter, your duty and privilege. While saying with Paul, 'God forbid that I should glory, save in *the cross* of our Lord Jesus Christ,' be ever found, also like him, 'looking for the blessed hope, and glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ.' Yes, wait, watch, work, until he come, for 'the night is far spent, and the day is at hand.' Keep sleep from your eyes, keep oil in your lamp, be ever on the outlook, and at a moment's warning be ready to go forth to meet the bridegroom when he cometh. Beware, and especially in times like these, of yielding to earthliness, or to impatience, or to faintheartedness, or to sloth, for 'the Lord is at hand,' and 'Redemption draweth nigh.' The very things, which, in our day, are so solemn and alarming, as *events*, are yet most joyful as *signs*, intimating, as they do, that the winter shall soon be past, the rain be over and gone, the flowers appear on the earth, the time of the singing of birds be come, and the voice of the turtle be heard in our land. 'All is night, that is here,' says holy Rutherford, 'in respect of ignorance and daily ensuing troubles, one always making way to another, as the ninth wave of the sea to the tenth. Therefore sigh and cry for the dawning of

Digitized by Google

that morning, and the breaking of that day of the coming of the Son of man, when the shadows shall flee away. Persuade yourself the King is coming. Read this letter sent before him, "Behold, I come quickly." Wait with the wearied night-watch for the breaking of the eastern sky.' "—Page 467.

The Seventh Vial; being an Exposition of the Apocalypse, and in particular of the pouring out of the Seventh Vial, with Special Reference to the Present Revolutions in Europe. Edinburgh: John Johnstone.

The discoveries made by the few are very seldom communicated directly by them to the many. The truths which were developed in the "Principia" of Newton, were not accessible in that form to the mass of mankind. But those who were able to follow the footsteps of the philosopher, published in more popular language the results of his investigations; and these are confidently believed by thousands, who have no knowledge whatever of the process by which they were attained. Exactly such a service is the work before us fitted to perform for the interpretation of the Apocalypse. The author handles, *currente calamo*, its several series of seals and trumpets and vials, presenting the deductions of previous expositors in a style so easy and flowing, as to ensure for his work very general acceptance. Of course, it will not be satisfactory to any real student of prophecy. Such an one will not be contented to be told in regard to the seals nothing more than this:—

> "That each seal ushered in a new dispensation to the Roman empire; and by three successive acts of judgment,—by the passage across its stage of the red, the black, and the pale horses,—war, famine, pestilence,—that powerful state was so exhausted and broken, that at last, in the opening of the sixth seal, that great revolution was accomplished, which issued in the elevation of Christianity in the person of Constantine to the throne of the Empire."

Nor will he be satisfied with a sketch of Apocalyptic interpretation, which does not even allude to those *synchronisms* upon which the very writers whom the author follows have built their system. Many, however, who read "The Seventh Vial," will, we hope, be induced to carry their researches further into a subject, at once so pleasant and so profitable.

In noticing a work of this nature, it cannot be expected that we should enter at all into its interpretations of the Apocalypse. The author has generally followed Mr. Elliott in his expositions, but he has not succeeded in convincing us of the correctness of that author's view of the death of the witnesses, which is a cardinal point in his theory. We are not yet satisfied that they were slain in the midst of the 1260 years of their witnessing, nor do we think that any one was entitled to follow Mr. Elliott's steps so closely, without at least noticing the objections urged against his view. The exposition which our author gives to the tenth chapter containing the vision of the angel with the little open book, is to our mind more satisfactory than that of Mr. Elliott, although both seem to us to have missed the true import of the prophecy. On the "reed like unto a rod," too, and the "measuring of the temple," the author has successfully, in our

Digitized by Google

opinion, corrected Mr. Elliott's view, although with him he has overlooked the important fact, that according to the best edition of the Apocalyptic text, there is *no connexion* whatever between the tenth and the eleventh chapters.

After all, the great question for commentators of the present day is, whether we are yet arrived at the time of the pouring out of the vials, or in other words, of the sounding of the seventh trumpet. It is one upon which we cannot enter now, though it must by and by be discussed in our pages; and if it should be determined in the negative, the work before us, along with many others, will at once lose its interest.

The Last Vials; being a Series of Essays upon the Subject of the Second Advent. By a CLERGYMAN. Second Edition. 2 vols. Seeleys. 1848.

IN many of the views advocated in these volumes, we concur. They are vigorously written, and fitted to call men's attention to what is in these days coming to pass, of the purposes of God. Some of the author's views, or at least statements, have already been belied by the events of the past year, while others are fulfilled. His tone is earnest, though perhaps it might have been more elevated and spiritual. We have some doubt as to what he says regarding the Jews, in connexion with the Advent, at p. 42 of vol. i. We hardly think him justified in using such strong language against the Emperor of Russia. We are amazed at his calling the Poles "a nation of gallant men and noble-minded women," quoting the well-known line,—

"Sarmatia fell, unwept, without a crime;"

seeing, any one acquainted with the real history of Poland would have told him, that there never was a nation since the days of Sodom and Gomorrah, upon whom has fallen a more righteous doom, though the hand that inflicted it might be oppressive and merciless.

There are several of his statements, on points connected with the future aspect of the world, which we should like to have discussed with him, but we are obliged to confine ourselves within very narrow limits. There is certainly much valuable thought and able writing throughout, though a little condensation would greatly have improved the work.

Revelation Readings: an Aid in Searching the Apocalypse. By the Rev. ALEXANDER DALLAS, Rector of Wonston. Vol. I. London: J. Nisbet and Co.

TO say how far we accord with, or in what respects we differ from the esteemed author of these "Revelation Readings," would require a longer review than we can give. We admire exceedingly the calm, yet earnest and truly Christian spirit which pervades the whole work. We differ from him in his view of the "four-and-twenty elders, and four living ones." We differ from him in regard to the Seals. We differ from him in his view of the Seven Thunders. In Scripture, we

Digitized by Google

conceive that the thunder is the voice of God, not of man,—of Christ, not of Antichrist. And as to his view of the witnesses, we must say that we are not yet convinced. We have read that part of his work with special care; but we think he has not succeeded in his proof. He thinks that the two witnesses are the whole Church of God, in heaven and earth, the Church in heaven testifying by means of what she has left on record (being dead, and yet speaking), the Church on earth testifying by the living voice. Our objection is that,—1. The want of proof that the Church in heaven has anything to do with the witness-bearing. 2. The prophecy itself, which makes the two witnesses precisely the same in kind, testifying in the same sackcloth, dying the same death, rising and ascending to heaven together.

We are inclined to suppose that the witnesses are the Church,—the *whole* Church on earth,—very probably represented at the time of their testimony by two notable individuals: not certainly Moses and Elias;—but into the details of this question we cannot enter.

An Introduction to the Canticles. London: Campbell. 1848.

THOUGH there is very precious thought and spiritual feeling contained here, betokening the author to be a man in communion with God and possessing much of the mind of Christ, we cannot wholly accord with all its statements. For example, he writes,

> "Adam was humbled and Adam suffered, I mean, of course, only in the symbol or mystery, ere he received Eve."—Page 9.

This we do not comprehend. That Adam was humbled in the symbol, yet not personally humbled, appears to us a contradiction.

Again—

> "All in the dispensation (*i. e.* the present) is gladdening."

This is a strange assertion, when it is through much *tribulation* that we are to enter the kingdom, when this is the very time of the bridegroom's absence, and when the wiping away of tears is specially reserved for the age to come. Other things struck us, but these are specimens. Though there is deep spirituality in the work, yet we cannot help feeling that there is something like *spiritual sentimentalism* also. The tone is elevated, but sometimes not healthy. The interpretations of Scripture are in several places over-refined.

Remarks on a Letter on Subjects connected with the Lord's Humanity. By J. N. DARBY. London: Campbell. 1848.

THIS is a controversy with which we have no desire to intermeddle, even though Mr. Darby traces all Mr. Newton's "horrible views," to his *prophetic* system. It is sad to see such bitterness among brethren. We do not refer merely to the hard words used, but to the unbrotherly insinuations made. If Mr. Darby cannot succeed in writing more *intelligibly* and making his case more plain, he will carry none but partisans along with him. We give no opinion upon the controversy, but we dislike the special pleading of his pamphlet.

Digitized by Google

The Mystery of Providence; or, the Prophetic History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. By the Rev. T. R. Birks. London: James Nisbet and Co., 1848.

This work is an exposition of the seven Apocalyptic Trumpets. The view which the author takes of them is entirely different from that of Mr. Elliott; and as his work is devoted exclusively to that one subject, he has the advantage of being able to give much more space to his details. In our next number, we intend to give a full review of this valuable contribution to the exposition of the Apocalypse. It has reached us too late for a lengthened review in our present number.

A Word in Season; being a Warning against prevailing Delusions. Edinburgh: R. Grant and Son. 1848.

Well-written, and very seasonable. Both prophetically and practically, it is a work for these last days. It is admirably suited for circulation among "the masses."

An Amended Translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews. By Henry Craik. London: S. Bagster and Sons.

Though we do not agree in all Mr. Craik's emendations, yet we do not hesitate to say, that this is really a valuable work,—a work of care and time and thought and critical skill. Our readers will find it very useful.

A View of the Evidences of Christianity, by W. Paley, D.D. New Edition, with Introduction, Notes, and Supplement. By the Rev. T. R. Birks, M.A. London: Tract Society. 1848.

A neat, cheap, portable edition of a very valuable standard work. Mr. Birks' additions increase greatly the value of this edition.

Aids to Prophetic Inquiry. By B. W. Newton. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1848.

Agreeing but partially with the principles and reasonings of this little work, we cannot recommend it as affording very much "aid to prophetic inquiry." Yet it is calmly and fairly written.

The Eighth King of Babylon the Great, &c. By J. B. Knight. Edinburgh: Ziegler. 1848.

This is not a work that we can recommend. Into details, however, we shall not enter. It should be suppressed, not circulated.

Digitized by Google

Extracts.

A Warning and an Exhortation.

"The time is a dark one. The crisis is urgent. God has begun in good earnest to deal with our land. His sword is lifted up to smite. Its flash has already struck terror into many a heart. What will be the terrors of its full and vengeful stroke? God has suffered long with us—he evidently means to suffer no more, unless we repent and turn to him with all our heart. Judgment has begun at the house of God. And what will the end be? God's voice is echoing through Britain, nay, through the world; 'What meanest Thou, O sleeper? Arise, call upon thy God, if so be that God will think upon us, that we perish not.'

"It is no shadow of a drifting vapour that is darkening the air. It is something more perilous, more permanent—something whose issues are beyond the stretch of man's wisdom to foresee or even to conjecture. These are not morning clouds, soon to rise and dissipate, leaving behind them as they ascend the purity of a cloudless noon. No; they are the falling shadows of the darkest evening which the world has ever known. These drops are not the 'early dew,' speedily evaporating and freshening both earth and sky. No; they are the first drops of the thunder-shower that is now mustering its terrors, and preparing to desolate the earth. These are not the mutterings of the departing tempest, fetching its last strokes of over-spent fury before it gives place to the breathless calm. No; they are the fore-runners of the wasting storm which is about to break upon a hundred shores.

"Meanwhile iniquity abounds. The people return not to the Most High, nor acknowledge his smiting hand. There are no signs of repentance, nor reformation, nor seeking of the face of God. Many disown and deny him. Many hate the thoughts of him and of his warnings. Many are *afraid* to think of him at all. Many are recognising him but in name and form. Few, few are bowing in the dust before him, confessing their own sins, the sins of the Church, and the sins of the land, that they may be mercifully forgiven, and his great anger turned away. Few are feeling for the honour of his name, the contempt of his Gospel, and the rejection of his beloved Son. Few hearts are touched, as was the heart of Jesus, with the prospect of calamity and ruin and woe, in which kindred, friends, country, may be ere long involved. Fewer still seem mourning over the eternal doom which is in sad reserve for the multitudes of this Christ-rejecting land.

"May not, then, the Church of Christ be called on to arise and plead? Is it not her duty to band together in cordial fellowship with all who know what it is to pray? Ought she not, with all haste, to snatch up her neglected censer, and rush between the living and the dead, if haply her intercession may yet prevail? Will not God yet be entreated for the land, and turn back the swelling flood of Infidelity, Popery,

Digitized by Google

superstition, intemperance, lasciviousness, blasphemy, under which the very soil seems withering, and the fruits of the field are pining away, as if the atmosphere were tainted with the pollutions of the land?

"And then the barrenness of our spiritual fields! Our leanness, our leanness! What a dearth! Where are the multitudes of awakened souls? Where is the '*daily* adding to the Church of such as shall be saved?' Where is the baptism of fire? Where is the ministry of life, and power, and blessing? Where are the inroads upon Satan's kingdom, and the shout of triumph, as tower after tower in his fortress is seen falling to the ground, and rank after rank giving way before the victorious onset of the 'army with banners?'

"Let us arise and plead. Let us league together for solemn intercession. Let us, as one family, bend the knee before the mercy-seat, and with our finger upon the Lord's gracious promise to *united* prayer, let us send up into the ear of our God one long, one earnest, one believing cry, such as he loves to hear, and such as he will most assuredly answer. We need much—let us ask much. We have many arguments—let us order them before him, and give him no rest. We have little time remaining—the night cometh. Let us lose not a moment, let us go at once into his presence-chamber, not to leave it till we have found Him whom our soul loveth, and till we have secured the answer from his lips. We have, at the same time, many sins; let us lay all these upon the altar, that the blood of the sacrifice may cleanse them thoroughly away, and thus our prayers may go up as the incense of cleansed and accepted ones—the intercessions of men who cannot be too confident and expecting, and who cannot be too importunate and persevering. 'Hast thou utterly rejected Judah? Hath thy soul loathed Zion? Why hast thou smitten us, and there is no healing for us? We looked for peace, and there is no good; and for the time of healing, and behold trouble! We acknowledge, O Lord, our wickedness, and the iniquity of our fathers: for we have sinned against thee. Do not abhor us, for thy name's sake; do not disgrace the throne of thy glory: remember, break not thy covenant with us. Are there any among the vanities of the Gentiles that can cause rain? or can the heaven give showers? Art not thou he, O Lord our God? THEREFORE WE WILL WAIT UPON THEE: for thou hast made all these things.' (Jer. xiv. 19—22.)"—*Anon.*

"I HAVE no hope of any extensive prevalence of true religion without the interference of angelic or some other extraordinary and yet unknown agency to direct its energies and conquer the vast combination of obstruction and hostility that opposes it. An amazing fact it is, that this hostility has hitherto been mainly successful. The triumphs of religion have been most limited and small, those of evil almost infinite. We see the melancholy result of an experiment of eighteen hundred years, the whole Christian era. This result compels me to conclude that religion is utterly incompetent to reform the world till it is armed with some new and most mighty powers, till it appears in a new and last dispensation."—*John Foster, Life,* vol. i., p. 91.

Digitized by Google

Correspondence.

The following letter from Mr. Faber was addressed to our *publisher*. But as its contents refer to our Journal and the premillennialism which it is designed to advocate, we give it at length; thanking that venerated student of prophecy for its courtesy and Christian tone:—

"*Sherburn House, Durham, October* 14, 1848.

"Sir,—I have to thank you for the courtesy of your letter, and the accompanying prospectus. You will easily conceive, that at seventy-five, I have no wish to engage in controversy. I would, therefore, only *suggest* to the Editors, to take up and discuss the prophecy contained in 2 Peter iii. For reasons which those gentlemen will perfectly understand, it is impossible that the *pre*millennarian theory can stand, unless the conflagration of the earth, there predicted and avowedly placed in the same category as the *universal* deluge, can be shown, on any fair principles of just criticism, to be *partial* only, and not *universal*. From a manifest consciousness of this, every *pre*millennarian, with whose writings I am acquainted, feels it necessary so to explain the prediction, as to get rid of that *universality*, which, according both to the natural construction of language and the entire context of the prophecy, is the obvious sense intended to be conveyed. Thus, Mr. Mede would confine the conflagration to the upper hemisphere of our earth; and thus Mr. Elliott would still more confine it to the platform of the Roman empire. No doubt, this confinement is *necessary* to the *pre*millennarian theory: but its *admissibility* ought to be proved *aliundè* on legitimate principles of criticism; and *that* I have never yet seen done. Perhaps, therefore, the Editors, taking this *suggestion* in good part, will address themselves, in their next number, to a consideration of this vital point. For unless the conflagration announced by St. Peter, can be proved by just argument, to be only *local* or *partial*, contrary, to its at least apparent character of *universality*, I shall be constrained to view the *pre*millennarian theory as altogether *unscriptural*.

"Until this *proof* can be made out, all the common arguments on the *pre*millennarian side, with which I am well acquainted, will go for nothing. In truth, that very common one, from Dan. vii. 9—13, and the parallel and synchronical passage in Rev. xix. 11—21, rests upon a mere *petitio principii*. Doubtless, a *coming* is there spoken of: but the *pre*millennarians *assume*, what they ought to have *proved*, but what never *can* be proved antecedently, that the *coming* in question *must* be a literal coming and *cannot* be a figurative coming; such as when Christ is said to *come* for the purpose of destroying Jerusalem, which the event has shown to be figurative.

"So little am I prejudiced on this question, that, on the great authority of Mede, I was once myself a *pre*millennarian, and expressed my views accordingly in a work on the Restoration of the Jews, which I published many years ago. But no man ought to write on prophecy, unless he has sufficient moral courage to *own* himself mistaken, when he *believes* himself to have been so. A severe examination convinced me of my error; and I certainly can never accede to the principle of your Journal, unless the Editors can dispose of 2 Peter iii.

"I write this in all Christian love, and with a full conviction that we are on the very eve of the predicted grand boulversement and the inauguration of the millennium: but *this* is quite a distinct question from the *other*.

"Yours truly, "G. S. Faber."

Having given Mr. Faber's letter, we may farther refer our readers to the Preface to his late learned and interesting work, "Eight Dissertations," in which this objection to pre-millennialism is more fully brought out and argued.

Digitized by Google

Had space allowed, we should have quoted the whole passage in justice to Mr. Faber and his argument.

In the above letter Mr. Faber remarks, "every pre-millennarian with whose writings I am acquainted, feels it necessary so to explain the prediction as to get rid of that universality, &c." On this we remark, that not a few pre-millennarians, we might say, *many*, admit this universality, and do *not* feel it necessary to get rid of it. We could mention several works in which this might be seen. And Mr. Faber surely forgets that at page 14 of the preface above referred to, he himself has noticed one of these, and endeavoured to turn the edge of his arguments. "Mr. Birks (writes he), more soberly, does not venture to deny the mundane universality of the conflagration; but since the controul of God over the two elements of fire and water is alike regally complete, and since the three children walked loose in the midst of the burning furnace without being consumed, he thinks that as the Noetic family escaped from the universal deluge of water, so a remnant may be spared even in the midst of the future universal deluge of fire."

We believe this to be the true solution of the difficulty. The risen and changed saints are "caught up" out of the conflagration. The remnant of Israel and the remnant of the Gentiles are preserved by God,—we know not where or how, in "their chambers," until the indignation be overpast; and by them Judea and the whole earth are to be re-peopled. Is this incredible? Is it impossible? Can we venture to say, it cannot be so, because *we* do not understand how it can be so. Nay, but is it not a possible and a likely thing? Has it not been God's way all along thus to preserve a people miraculously either in the midst of judgments or by snatching them out of such judgments, as seemed best to him? Enoch he caught up out of the judgments. Noah he preserved in the midst of them. Lot he snatched out of them. Rahab he preserved in the midst of them. When the ten plagues successively smote Egypt with desolation, Israel was protected from them all. Whatever the plague might be, Israel was safe. An unseen arm circled them around. In the midst of darkness they had light. When the cattle of Egypt were dying around, "of the cattle of the children there died not one." When the ashes of the furnace were sprinkled towards heaven and became a boil breaking forth on man and beast, it was the Egyptians alone that suffered. When the hail smote the land so terribly Israel was exempt. When the first-born of Egypt perished, Israel suffered not. When Pharaoh pressed sore on Israel, the sea opened to let them pass. When, in later times, the Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold, as if utterly to overwhelm Jerusalem, God interposed his shield, Israel was safe, and the enemy lay dead in one night by tens of thousands. In the lions' den Daniel was preserved by God. Out of the fiery furnace the three children came unhurt. Thus in every conceivable way has God showed us how he can preserve a people for himself, whether from the water or the fire, or the plague or the sword, or the lion's mouth. It matters not to Him. And is it impossible that in the latter day some of these scenes should be repeated on a larger scale, or similar ones enacted? Reasoning from God's past dealings, we should say, it is not only possible, it is not only credible, it is also most likely and probable.

Nor let it be said, that in these past cases of miraculous preservation, it was only the *righteous* who escaped. In several of these it was the *wicked* as well as the righteous. In the ark, Ham was preserved; and we have no evidence that either he or his wife was righteous. Certainly *he* was not. In Zoar, Lot's daughters were preserved, and, assuredly, *they* were not godly. So with Rahab's relatives. So with multitudes in Israel, when coming out of Egypt. And why should not God, if it please him to do so, preserve even an unconverted remnant both of Israel and the Gentiles? With these instances before us, we think the following statement of Mr. Faber entirely without foundation; "In this manner, by being caught up, will all the then living saints of God be preserved, and as the residue will be the irreclaimably wicked alone, the same parallelism, the deluge, will show, that as *all* the ungodly perished of old in the universal deluge of water, so *all* the ungodly at the final consummation,

Digitized by Google

will perish in the analogous universal deluge of fire." (Pp. 15, 16.) So far from this being the case, most of the various parallelisms would lead us to conclude that *all* the ungodly are not to be destroyed, but some preserved, in that great crisis-day of the world. Judging then from the past, we should be led to a different inference from Mr. Faber, who affirms that such a thing is "not only altogether unsupported by Scripture, but is virtually contradicted by Scripture."—Page 14. Let us put the case as follows, for the sake of illustration:—Suppose it were predicted, that the world was again to be overflowed with water, and after that, re-inhabited by the same race as before, would there be anything unlikely in the opinion, that God would make provision in his own way for preserving a remnant to re-people it, as he did before? Suppose it were to be predicted that universal pestilence were to fall upon the earth, exterminating its inhabitants; and after it had passed away, the earth was to be re-peopled by the same race; would there be anything unscriptural in the idea that God might make provision for keeping alive a remnant? Suppose it were to be predicted that the "noisome beasts" were to be let loose over the whole earth in every region to devour its inhabitants, would there be anything incredible or unscriptural in supposing that God could shut their mouths, so that the remnant whom he had chosen would, like Daniel, be uninjured?

If, then, it be predicted that this world is to be subjected to a second deluge—a deluge of fire, as universal as the first, is there anything incredible, unscriptural, or unlikely in the supposition, that a remnant may be saved out of it, in God's own way, to re-people the purged earth?

In confirmation of this view, we may refer to several passages of Old Testament prophecy. Let us take the 24th of Isaiah, which we are inclined to regard as synchronous with second Peter. There we have a picture of desolation, ruin, and extermination, as complete as that given by the apostle: "Behold the Lord maketh the earth empty and maketh it waste, and turneth it upside down ...... the curse hath devoured the earth, and they that dwell therein are desolate; therefore, the inhabitants of the earth are burned, and few men left ...... the earth is utterly broken down, the earth is clean dissolved (the very language of Peter), the earth is moved exceedingly ...... the earth shall reel to and fro like a drunkard and shall be removed as a cottage ...... it shall fall and not rise again." Can expressions be stronger than these to denote utter desolation—desolation as universal, as wasting and destructive as the fire described by Peter? Yet in the midst of this scene a remnant is spoken of as preserved, and the next chapter describes this very earth renewed and re-peopled. Or take the thirty-fourth chapter of the same book. A similar scene is described and the language used is still more closely similar to that of the apostle; "all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll," &c. Yet the next chapter describes earth re-peopled evidently by those who had come out of these fiery judgments. There are several similar passages, which all set forth a scene as terrific and universal as that of Peter, yet all speak of men surviving these judgments and re-peopling the earth,—and these men evidently not the risen saints, but Jews and Gentiles,—men in flesh and blood as we are.

But that which is perfectly conclusive on this point is the passage in the sixty-fifth of Isaiah, to which Peter evidently refers when he says, "we *according to his promise* look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." The new earth of Isaiah and of Peter must be synchronous, or else the citation of Peter has no meaning. What can "according to his promise" mean but just "We (as Isaiah has foretold), expect a new earth to come out of this conflagration?" We turn then to Isaiah to see what this new earth is, and we find it a new earth in which there is a Jerusalem; in which there are infants, children, old men, houses, vineyards, wolves, lambs, lions, serpents. How can Mr. Faber explain this? Surely he will not deny the synchronism? He cannot deny that Peter is citing Isaiah. And as Peter tells us that the new earth has been the result of the conflagration, he must admit that a remnant, just like that preserved along with Noah in the ark, has been saved by God to re-people the globe. If he deny that Peter is quoting Isaiah,—or if

Digitized by Google

he maintain that Isaiah is figurative,—or if he say that any of the fore-cited passages are figurative,—then, why might not we be allowed (if we were inclined) to say, that the conflagration in Peter is figurative also? And might we not say of himself, what he says of some of us, "the unequivocal language of St. Peter (and Isaiah, we add) by the Procrustean process of the *quodlibet ex quolibet*, and for the mere purpose of serving a turn in exposition is mercilessly compelled to deliver anything rather that what it really does deliver."—Page 18. And we might use this language of his with no less force against his *figurative* interpretation of the coming in the twenty-fourth of Matthew. If that be figurative, we know not what in Scripture can be proved literal. But (as Mr. Faber says of *us* in reference to another passage) the truth is, "it is a mill-stone suspended from the neck of *post-millennialism*, which no effort and no ingenuity can shake off."

One remark more and we are done. Granting that the passage in Peter is fatal to pre-millennialism, it is equally fatal to post-millennialism. For by no effort or ingenuity can any one thrust in a millennium of holy blessedness between the scoffing and wickedness of the last days, and that conflagration. The wickedness began in the times of the apostles. It was to increase, spread, swell, wax worse and worse, till it ended in the fiery flood. Where can Mr. Faber wedge in a holy millennium between the first and second comings of the Lord?

IS THE APOCALYPSE FULFILLED OR UNFULFILLED?

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

DEAR SIR,—It is a very desirable thing, that every view of prophetic truth which is put forward, should be thoroughly canvassed and examined. Nor can the propounder of truth, if he really care for it, more than for the credit of his own discernment, be impatient of this. On the contrary, at every detection of error into which he may have fallen, he must rejoice, because that thereby, at least negatively, he makes an advance towards the knowledge that is dear to him. In this spirit, I trust, I should be very glad and thankful to God to have any error that might attach to my interpretation of the prophetic word pointed out to me. Accordingly, as a pamphlet from my humble pen introductory to the exposition of the Apocalypse * has been somewhat elaborately reviewed in the first number of your periodical,† I have endeavoured,—as no doubt the writer intended I should, amongst his other readers,—to gather profit from it; nor do I doubt but that at all events, it will have the effect of rendering me more accurate. This benefit from the criticism of an acute mind such as evidently attaches to my censor, I should be sorry to lose; but he must pardon me for saying, that the benefit would not be the less appreciated by me, or his readers in general, if he had written in a *fairer* and *more Christian* spirit. His defect in regard to fairness is obvious, in that, contrary to all precedent I am acquainted with, whilst he favours my pamphlet with a most methodical form of review, he carefully suppresses its title, &c., making it inaccessible to the candid reader, who might desire, by a perusal of it, to judge for himself. For the most part, also, he paraphrases my sentiments, and, as not unusually happens in such cases, even without design, he sometimes misrepresents me. As to his failure in *Christian spirit*, let the following extracts bear witness:—"*What person of any sobriety of thought will venture on such extravagant assertions?*" "*The attempt to be unusually profound has led to a series of demonstrable contradictions.*" "*How is it possible to contend with reasons so shadowy which change their form and colour like the hues of the cameleon, or the clouds of the sky?*" "*The whole argument is made up of three or four fancies, contradictory to each other, and to the plain facts of Scripture.*" "*An error almost astounding, as unreasonable in the abstract, as the conclusions to which it would lead are grotesque and absurd.*" "*Factitious and fanciful style of interpretation.*" "*Unbeseeming confidence.*"

* "Apocalyptic Interpretation." Nisbet and Co.
† Art. V.—"The general scope of the Apocalypse." Page 38.

Digitized by Google

"*A congeries of strange and manifest errors.*" "*When such a view can be embraced, it is almost time to suspect all reasoning, and to pray that God may restore the spirit of a sound mind to those who can wander so far from the plain meaning of the text*" I much lament that such "railing" should have been resorted to by a Christian brother, instead of a calm investigation of the truth. Perhaps his conscience will do its office, if, in regard to the last sentence here extracted, worthy of being the climax, I inquire, has he indeed "*prayed*" for me? I am sure if he have it will astonish your readers as much as myself.

But hereupon, Mr. Editor, you must allow me to add, that I have been not a little perplexed at the fact that a paper of such tone escaped *your* supervision, especially after your entreating your readers to join you, in regard to the conduct of your journal, in deprecating at a throne of grace the employment of "*hasty speech, or sharp unbrotherly disputation.*" Moreover, what makes this *lapsus* the more extraordinary is, that in your notice of a discussion between two other prophetical writers, I find you speak thus:—"*Surely language like the following is unseemly in a saint*;—'*It is very convenient to say this, but can any reasonable man be expected to receive things stated in this way?*' Again: '*This rests merely upon a decidedly bad and false translation of Greek.*' Again: '*This is a complete mis-statement of the text.*' Again: '*A system as regardless of geographical fact as we have found it to be of Scripture statements, and grammar itself.*' '*I never met with a book like this in its assertions.*' "*These,*" you add, "*are not a tithe of the unkind expressions scattered through the volume. Surely these things ought not so to be. It is sad indeed that a controversy upon Apocalyptic interpretation between two Christian men should call forth such unbrotherliness of language and tone. May we ourselves be kept from this!*"* Surely this language to which you except is not as obnoxious to censure as the specimens I have adduced from the pen of my reviewer, and yet the latter is admitted without note or comment into a regular article appearing under your responsibility. The oversight no doubt can be explained, and it is principally with a view to giving you an opportunity for this, and vindicating the character of your journal, that I call your attention to it.†

With this simple appeal I now gladly leave all personal matters, and proceed to the consideration of the article in question. Perhaps, in this case, as in others, "out of the eater may come forth meat, and out of the strong may come forth sweetness;" nor should we suffer ourselves, if we can help it, to miss a benefit by reason of the way in which it is conveyed to us.

The first thing, then, which my reviewer sets himself to oppose is the principle I had advanced, that all prophecy has its principal use before its fulfilment. Admit that it is useful afterwards, that it evinces the being and government of God, and the truth of Divine revelation, and that the world may be startled by the coincidence between prophecy and the event; yet *the Church of God* waits not for this, to be *fully persuaded* that all that God speaks is true; and this, by the way, is the very expression employed to denote the reception given by

* "The Quarterly Journal of Prophecy," pages 71, 72.

† We must decline entering upon explanations in reference to these points. We might perhaps say respecting many things in our journal, besides those noticed by Mr. K., that we should have liked such and such expressions modified, or altered, or softened; but it is quite impossible for us to go into any details of explanation. But will Mr. Kelly allow us to say (and we do it with all brotherly kindness), that he himself is an offender as well as we in this matter. In his "Apocalyptic Interpretation" there are many expressions of unprovoked sharpness. Thus he speaks of former expositors of the Apocalypse:—"He (Mr. Elliott) found in regard to the Apocalypse the worst of monopolies prevailing; learned men making a science of faith, and turning, as it were, the plain letters of God's word, designed for the poor of the flock as well as themselves, *into the signs of Algebraic quantities, which they only could read.* Thus, a rescue of this precious well of Divine truth from *the muddling conceits of theological system-mongers* had to be effected, like that of human learning in former days, from the dogmatism of the schools." (P. 15.) Again: "*Forsooth, indeed,* John's own thoughts when in the isle of Patmos, most probably, in Mr. E.'s estimation, ran in this direction!" (P. 17.) "He reduces a real substantial event into a cipher, for a convenient end. But *how can fair play be expected for human records* at the hands of those *who, under the influence of preconceived system* so treat the Divine." (P. 28.) There are other expressions also, besides these, which Mr. Kelly will feel he was hardly justified in using towards others,—especially if disposed to complain of the language used by others respecting himself.—EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

Abraham to an unfulfilled prophecy of most improbable import, according to man's judgment: "Being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb: he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully persuaded that, what he had promised, he was able also to perform." (Rom. iv. 19—21.) Noah likewise is an example of the same: "By faith Noah was *warned of God of things not seen as yet*." And not only was his estimate of the future formed by the word of prophecy, but his practice was determined by it: "Moved with fear he prepared an ark to the saving of his house." (Heb. xi. 7.) And we have many instances of the same. See Dan. ix. 2, 3, where Daniel is thus practically moved by Jeremiah's still unfulfilled prophecy, concerning the seventy years' captivity, to seek further counsel of his God. See also Acts xxviii. 25—28, where Paul appeals to Isaiah vi. as the ground on which he acted, in turning from the Jews to preach to the Gentiles. In fact, prophecy touching future good, is but another name for *promise*, whereby the child of God is said "to escape the corruption that is in the world through lust." (2 Pet. i. 4.) And prophecy touching future evil, is but another name for *warning*. In regard to the former, the Believer realizes the blessing, and is cheered by the assured hope of it. In regard to the latter, he sees the shoals and quicksands before him, of which he has to beware. Thus unfulfilled prophecy is as a "light shining in a dark place, (and the world will be such throughout this dispensation), until the day dawn." (2 Pet. i. 19.) But if the child of God were to say, It will be time enough for me to interpret the promise and warning of my heavenly Father when the event takes place, it is obvious, that, for the prime end for which it was given, this would be too late. Suppose, for example, that when God announced to Noah the flood that was about to come upon the earth, Noah had contented himself with believing in it when the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened, (and this was what his contemporaries did), he would have been inevitably involved in the destruction by which they were overtaken. Prophecy, therefore, I maintain, is designed of God to be taken intelligent cognisance of by his people *prior to its fulfilment*. It may serve, indeed, afterwards to enliven their conviction that, however the Divine forbearance is abused by the wicked, yet it is God who controls all events; and it may confirm their faith in the Divine wisdom, who generally brings his purposes to pass in an unforeseen way; it may also arouse the Deist and the Idolater from their infatuation, to which end we find it appealed to in Isa. xli. 23. But these are only its incidental results, and not to be confounded with its main end.

Now the application I made of this very important principle to the subject in hand was this:—Here is the Book of the Revelation, concerning which the prevailing notion among Christians, following Mr. Elliott's guidance, is, that all the prophecies in it have been fulfilled, at least up to the outpouring of the sixth vial. But if this be the case, then has not the Church of God been profited by it as *unfulfilled prophecy*. For it is virtually admitted that none of the events which are alleged to have been contemplated were anticipated by believers, even those actually concerned in them. One fact is notorious, that the primitive Christians, those who lived in the apostolic days, and immediately after, expected the Lord's coming, and the end of the age daily. Gibbon, the historian, records this by way of casting ridicule upon them: Mr. Elliott, also, in his history of apocalyptic interpretation, thus speaks of the establishment of Christianity by the Emperor Constantine:—"A revolution by which Christianity should be established in the prophetically denounced Roman empire *was an event, the contingency of which had never occurred apparently to the previous exponents of Christian prophecy*." * And, if the early Christians did not foresee from the Apocalypse the establishment of Christianity, neither did they, we may suppose, its warning afterwards, nor its revival at the Reformation. Again, this last memorable event is affirmed by Mr. Elliott to be prophesied of in Rev. xi. But not merely were preceding generations of the Church blind to this, but the various Reformers who led the movement seem utterly

* "Horæ Apocalypticæ." By Rev. E. B. Elliott. Vol. iv., page 316.

Digitized by Google

unconscious of such an animating topic being contained in the book. As to Luther, we know he denied its very canonicity, and Calvin declined giving any commentary upon it. To this effect I had said in my pamphlet, arguing from Mr. Elliott's admission in his preface :—"It is, therefore, an important fact to be borne in mind, that, taking the import of the Apocalypse to be what Mr. Elliott assigns, it has not, as prophecy, advantaged the Church up to the present age. For example, the establishment of Christianity under Constantine, so prominently pourtrayed to Mr. Elliott's view, took the Church by surprise. The Fathers who flourished prior thereto, and who even wrote on the Apocalypse, saw no such consummation approaching, but rather the reverse. Nor did the prophecy of the two witnesses, in which Mr. Elliott so distinctly sees the history of the Reformation in the sixteenth century, animate those tried men who were engaged in it! This consequence cannot be evaded. I repeat, then, that, according to Mr. Elliott, only as converted by fulfilment into history has the Apocalypse proved profitable for instruction. And how startling an admission! True, indeed, on this very ground, until some twenty years ago, fulfilled prophecy only was esteemed worthy of study by the mass of professing Christians, and that in order to convince Deists of the being and revelation of God; whilst, to occupy the mind with unfulfilled prophecy was deemed speculative and presumptuous in the extreme. But who would have thought of such a mature student on the subject, as Mr. Elliott professes to be, practically serving up this exploded notion—in connexion too with an exposition of the Apocalypse, to which the solemn preface is, 'Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, for the time is at hand.'"

Now, how does my reviewer answer this? He does not, be it observed, grapple with my position and proceed to overturn it, but appearing at first to admit it, that is, that Mr. Elliott's system of interpretation compromises the value of the Apocalypse as unfulfilled prophecy, he endeavours to prove that the same may be said of the futurist system which is advocated by me. Afterwards, indeed, in the course of a comparison which he institutes between the two systems, he slides into *assertions* that Mr. Elliott's does not deprive the Apocalypse of its serviceableness as unfulfilled prophecy; but they are *only* assertions, and of a very equivocal kind, and not one word do I find advanced in the way of proof, or to meet the instances which I have cited. I proceed to weigh his observations seriatim.

And first, touching his retaliatory accusation against the futurist system, which, by the way, if true, is no vindication of his own, for it would only expose both systems as erroneous. He thus writes :—

"*What now is the real contrast between the two systems. On the futurist view, no part of the work has hitherto been of use as fulfilled prophecy, to strengthen the faith of Christians in the ceaseless providence of God.*"

The reply to this is obvious. Of course, if the Apocalypse be *unfulfilled*, it has not had its use as *fulfilled*. This is a *truism*. But I will go further, and admit that it has been of comparatively little use to the Church, *as prophecy* at all; at least in modern days, just because we have not looked at it in the light of "the day of the Lord." We have not "kept its words," its "true sayings," but have interpreted them to mean anything but what they do mean. We have, in fact, too long taken the word of *man* for the warrant of its fulfilment, and that symbolically, according to the ingenuity of its different commentators, who, like the scribes of old, however unintentionally, have taught for *doctrines the traditions of men*. Thus, when the writer adds, that it has been "*a fruitful nursery of mere delusions*," I can assent to it, i. e., that man has for a long time made it such. But I must contend, that this has not been "*on the futurist view*" of it, and I adduce the writer himself as a witness for this, at least to his own satisfaction; for he says, a little further on, that the futurist view has been confined "*to six or seven writers of our own days, and the small minority of Christians who have faith in their novel principle of interpretation.*" If, indeed, he seriously maintain that it is only thus recently that the Apocalypse has been perverted, as he describes, I must relieve him from bearing this testimony for my point; but I cannot imagine his having recourse to this; for it is acknowledged on all

Digitized by Google

sides, as a well-attested fact, that, after the very early ages of the Christian era, the book was, for the most part, utterly neglected, and the interpretations which have since come down to us are signally discordant. Bishop Hurd does not hesitate to say, that, though "a spirit of inquiry," as to the book, "sprung up with the revival of letters" at the Reformation, yet "that the book itself was disgraced by the fruitless efforts of its commentators," *until* "*Joseph Mede arose.*" * A glance at Mr. Elliott's synopsis will at once show the same; while he also admits, that, even after the impulse given to prophetic study by the French Revolution of the last century, not only were former difficulties left unsolved, but "*new mistakes and errors*" were so "*multiplied*," that the Rev. S. R. Maitland "*dashed in like a falcon into a dovecote*," and "*made havoc of them, with such effect, as to prepare the way, in England, for the adoption of the futurist system.*" † If, then, my reviewer subscribe to this, he is a witness, I repeat, with Mr. Elliott, that it is not on *that* system that the Apocalypse has been rendered "a fruitful nursery of mere delusions." This "nursery," or "*dovecote*," as Mr. Elliott innocently varies the expression, existed beforehand, and the futurist system was rather the *effect* of it than the cause. My reviewer proceeds :—

"*Next*" (on the futurist view), "*the whole must have been useless, for seventeen centuries, as a prophecy of events near at hand, of practical interest and concern to those successive generations; since no such events are contained in the prediction.*"

To this, the reply is very simple; as if former generations of the Church mistook the visions of this book, as relating to a positively adjacent period, instead of, on the futurist system, to "*the day of the Lord*," continuously impending throughout the night of this dispensation, the chronological length of which was concealed from them,—of course, they were so far exposing themselves to temptation and a snare; for such adjacent period might have arrived during their lifetime, and then might have ensued to them the dangerous recoil of disappointed hope. But, still, so far as they apprehended the events predicted, to be simply impending, they, doubtless, derived profit from the book; nor was the protraction of such events beyond their day, more inconsistent with this, than that of the Second Advent of the Lord Jesus, with the continuous waiting for the same, which characterized the Thessalonians. (1 Thess. i. 10.) The question, however, which I have raised, and to which my reviewer ought to have addressed himself, is not, how far former generations of Christians may have been in error, like some of our own days, in prematurely "fixing times and seasons,"—but, could this book have answered its end, *as prophecy*, if its predictions were discerned by them, only when fulfilled? To this conclusion, I have shown that Mr. Elliott's *ex post facto* interpretation leads, and that it is, therefore, fundamentally erroneous :—

"*Thirdly*," (my reviewer adds), "*it has been of no real use, in all its earlier visions, as a warning of events to happen at the close of two thousand years, since no Christian, for so many ages, ever applied it to such events as the futurist scheme supposes, occurring at that distance of time.*"

Thus, because so many centuries have already elapsed since this book was given to the Church, it is made a necessary adjunct of futurist views, that those who held them, if any, in former times, foresaw, also, these intervening centuries; but, need I say, the supposition of this is not only gratuitous, but incompatible with the posture of continuous expectation of the end, which has been enjoined upon believers from the beginning? Disencumbered, then, of this assumption, the proposition before us comes to this, that *no Christians in former times ever interpreted the Apocalypse as futurists do.* But, how can this be affirmed? Is it not a fact, that amongst the earliest Fathers, such as Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, and Lactantius, are found many of the distinguishing views of the futurists, such as the personality and reign of the Antichrist, for *three literal years and a half*—his appearance, as a false Messiah, in connexion with the Jewish people—his mimicry of our Lord, in his sending forth apostles—the insulation of the last of Daniel's seventy weeks from the rest, the appearance in the first half of that week of the two witnesses of chap. ix.,—not Churches or corporate bodies, but living men, endued with miraculous

* "Hurd's Works," vol. v. p. 270. † Vol. iv. p. 470.

Digitized by Google

powers, prophesying for the *literal period of three years and a half*, undergoing, also, in Jerusalem—the place of their testimony—a literal death and resurrection! But to go further, how can it be determined by my reviewer, that simple-minded believers *in every age*, did not look at this book according to its title, as relating to the period of the Saviour's second Advent? They may not have been conspicuous enough to be reported of by historians; but just as there was a remnant in Elijah's time—seven thousand that had not bowed the knee to Baal, so there may have been, whilst lost sight of amidst the degeneracy which quickly followed the decease of the apostles, many children of God, not carried away by the current of mere human tradition. May not these faithful ones, then, have realized the time of the end as ever suspended over them, as those do, who are called futurists, and, besides, have continually improved to themselves the whole scenes of foretold events, regulating their consciences and hopes and walk by *principles of the Divine conduct therein disclosed?*

But even this need not be contended for. Admitting that it is only *now* that the futurist views have been taken up, and, by an insignificant minority, still the whole Church of God may yet come to be awakened out of its bondage to human tradition, and to see the book in its true aspect, thus *proving its benefit as unfulfilled prophecy*. Whereas, according to Mr. Elliott's interpretation, and supported by his friend, *the greater portion of it having been already fulfilled, without the Church having intelligently discerned it beforehand*,* no such benefit can possibly accrue. The time for this is irrevocably past. The book may be improved as history, but that is all.

Having thus shown, I trust, by fair reasoning, that the futurist view of the Apocalypse does not nullify its prophetic usefulness to any generation of the Church, but that, on the other hand, *it alone*, under the circumstances of the case, maintains for it that usefulness, contrary to the allegations of my reviewer, I now proceed to examine his apparent vindication of Mr. Elliott's system from my strictures on it in this respect. He thus writes:—"*On the wider view of its meaning*" (i. e., Mr. Elliott's view), "*the prophecy has announced to every age of the Church, and each generation of believers, events that were really near at hand.*" Now, the allegation I have made is, that confessedly, according to Mr. Elliott, the import of the Apocalypse, so far as he holds it to be fulfilled, was not discerned beforehand by the Church. I have already quoted his admission to this effect concerning the seals, which he explains as ushering in the establishment of Christianity. I repeat his words:—"*This was an event the contingency of which had never occurred to them.*" But, what does he say further, in introducing the visions of the trumpets? why, that the anticipations that prevailed were "*in total contrast*" with this true prospective of the future; and that while apostasy and judgment were at the very door, exultation only, as though the Millennium had begun, characterized the Church! Need I again advert also, to the barrenness, as prophecy (according to Mr. Elliott's interpretation), of chapter xi., where we have the vision of the two witnesses? If, then, these principal topics of the Apocalypse were unappreciated by Christians, even by the generation actually concerned in them, as intimations of what was coming, how can my reviewer say of the book generally, that it "announced," or rather, was *apprehended to announce* (for this is the point in question) *events that were really near at hand?* The remainder of his paragraph, on this head, contains but variations of the foregoing clause, and even doubtfully asserted;

* Nor only this; it appears also, that when it was fulfilled, according to Mr. Elliott, the fulfilment was not recognised for centuries afterwards! Nor is it recognised even now, by many who are admitted to be candid Christian men, notwithstanding Mr. Elliott's juxtaposition of prophecy and event, aided by his accompanying comment. To exemplify this, I subjoin the following extract from the letter of a dear friend and brother in the ministry, rather prejudiced, as will appear, in favour of Mr. Elliott's work:—"I well remember, just after Mr. Elliott's book came out, reading to a party of intelligent, pious persons (they were well-educated gentlepeople, too) his exposition of the sixth seal. They listened with much attention, and the trial was favourable, for they were not attached to any system of prophecy, as such. Besides, I had just gotten the book, and made sure from all I heard, that it contained the true interpretation; so that I previously imparted to them my own sanguine expectation on the occasion. As soon as I had finished, the exclamation was,—'*Is that* ALL—*does he mean that it was so fulfilled?*' 'I shall never forget," he adds, "the feeling of disappointment that pervaded the party."

Digitized by Google

for example, he says : "It has been at least *possible*, and indeed *highly probable*, that many believers in every age, should have been warned by it of imminent changes ;" presently, indeed, he waxes bolder, and adds, in the same breath,—"*it becomes certain*" that this was the case ; but, still, *no evidence* is adduced. What I have already urged, therefore, must suffice in the way of reply.

Let me, however, in conclusion, commend to his candid consideration, how the line of argument he has adopted against the futurists might be turned by some brother against the Pre-millennial Advent. The reviewer believes, I shall suppose, that the prophecies of the Old Testament, such as Isaiah ii. 1—5, which have been wont to be interpreted of the prosperity of the Christian Church of this dispensation, relate not to this, but to the future glory of the Jews. To this it is answered, that such a view makes the Old Testament prophecies "a fruitful nursery of mere delusions ;" for, until lately, the prevailing notion throughout the Church was different, that these prophecies were appealed to in all ages, to animate the hope of Christians in the progress of the Gospel, and that their faith had been confirmed by many glimpses of their actual fulfilment;" that to interpret them differently now, and make them refer to a future period, would prove them to have "been nothing but false expectations." "They have been wholly useless," it might be continued, "as *fulfilled* prophecy, and just as useless, for nearly sixteen centuries as prophecy *unfulfilled*, while their benefit will have been confined to a few writers of this century, and the minority of Christians who have faith in their novel principle of interpretation." Such is the exact parallel of my reviewer's argument, and substantially, as may be observed, in his own words. But would he not exclaim against it ? May I not trust, then, that he will repudiate it as unworthy of him in this case ; and if he would not yield to the clamour of traditional authority (for it really comes to this) against *one* truth, forbear to employ it against what many Christian brethren as firmly believe to be *another*. Let the appeal be to *the word itself*, and we shall be satisfied. In the present paper, I have confined myself to the elucidation of one fundamental point at issue between us,—as it happens, the first in order. Our readers will, perhaps, collect from this, which party is most likely to have truth on his side, touching the whole controversy. Here, also, I am willing to leave the subject. Still, if your pages are open to me, I shall be glad, with God's help, to discuss, in succeeding numbers, the topics which remain.

Yours, &c.,

London, Nov. 21, 1848. JAMES KELLY.

(*To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."*)

SIR,—With unfeigned pleasure I hail the appearance of this journal, which, with God's blessing, may be the means of calling the attention of many Christians to the signs of the times in which we live. The general tone of the first number is such as to lead me to hope that in its pages will be found the platform on which students of prophecy, who cannot as yet see eye to eye in all matters, may meet and discuss their several difficulties in a Christian spirit. Presuming on your kindness, I therefore trouble you and your readers with a few cursory remarks suggested, while reading the pages of your first number. The first article, "Our Connexion with the Future," wisely and truly asserts, that prophecy has heretofore been abused ; and its study has led to extravagant views. In this general truth I do most cordially concur ; yet when I pass on to the particular instances of extravagances that are cited I am somewhat stumbled. The opinion, that Enoch and Elijah are the two witnesses, is the extravagance that is placed in the forefront, characterized as destitute of all proof. Now, to say nothing of Enoch, (it being questionable whether his place is not to be supplied by Moses,) I am a little surprised to hear that the Prophet Elijah, being one of the witnesses, is regarded as destitute of all Scripture truth; Malachi assures us that Elijah will come before the great and *terrible* day of the Lord : a prediction, *partially* fulfilled only in John the Baptist ; and our Lord

Digitized by Google

intimates that it shall have a further fulfilment in Matt. xvii. 11. The whole proof has been ably drawn out in Dr. M'Caul's sermon on the subject, in the Bloomsbury Lectures. Further, the fact that Elijah appeared in the transfiguration with our Lord, suggests that his further work is in intimate connexion with the appearance of our Lord in glory, of which that transfiguration was the type. But chiefly is Elijah identified with one of the witnesses by Rev. xi. 6, which imputes to the witnesses the power of shutting heaven for three and a-half years, the precise period during which Elijah actually did shut the heaven. A similar proof with regard to Moses may be adduced. The curious argument from the Septuagint, alluded to in your pages, is one of those proofs, which are so eminently calculated to weaken a good cause, that I can only regret your correspondent was not more fortunate in meeting with one capable of defending the opinions he held. Very different is the dogma that follows, asserting that Napoleon is the eighth head. Rightly is this said to be destitute of all support from Scripture. With respect to the *literal* Babylon, next alluded to, I would observe, this is a very different case from that of Napoleon. I believe Babylon to be Rome, but I cannot agree with the remark I find in your pages, "We ask for proof, but there is none." It is proof enough that Scripture says, "Babylon." With us, who differ therefrom, lies the *onus probandi*, showing that here Scripture is to be taken mystically, not literally. I think in this case it can be clearly shown. But the note affixed to this sentence speaks of the idea of an Infidel Antichrist as an error, generated by the above error. Now this is not correct. We believe that the last final Antichrist will be Infidel, because no other character comes up to all that is predicated of him in the Scriptures: but we never deny that Popery is the present form of Antichrist; and the last Infidel Antichrist will be the heir of all the enormities of his predecessors: no sympathy, therefore, no apology, no pity for Rome—and yet we believe in a final Infidel Antichrist. With these exceptions the article in question has my most cordial admiration, and may the sentiments it advocates become those of many hearts of Christ's waiting people!

The remarks of Article II.—"God's theory of the World," are admirable; on these I have but one remark to make; they seem to suppose that the theorists, who expect a gradual improvement, till the Gospel is spread over the whole world and converts the world, have abandoned their expectation. No such thing! The more iniquity abounds, the more they think they see the way opening for the spread of truth; if anarchy takes the place of order in any state, they hail it as the beginning of the downfall of despotism, and making a way for the introduction of the Bible and the Gospel! Such ideas are indeed little short of infatuation, nevertheless they are held and advocated by most of those who look to the agency of our great Societies, to convert the world, and nothing but the result will convince them that they are wrong.

Passing over Art. III.,—"on Unfulfilled Prophecy—with Objections and Difficulties," which in my humble opinion is *most admirable* throughout, I will trespass on your kindness for a few remarks on "The General Scope of the Apocalypse." This is, in fact, a remonstrance against the views of the school commonly called futurist. Without any direct mention of an adversary, the writer is throughout evidently contending with the arguments of some one antagonist, the author of "a recent Pamphlet on Apocalyptic Interpretation." Now there is a large and growing class of futurists, who are made so by necessity, by conviction, from their utter inability to bring their judgments to coincide with the interpretations already given of presumed fulfilled prophecy; they have no system to maintain—they have no prejudice in favour of "my view of the seals," or "my interpretation of the trumpets," or "my theory of the witnesses,"—all this seems to them a following of Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas,—they desire to follow Christ alone, and they have not yet been able to see that the Apocalypse is a history, because those who claim it as such cannot harmoniously divide the details; and because, when they take the trouble to search history for themselves, they find many eras, which will suit equally well, all or any of the seals, trumpets, or vials. In fact, a little ingenuity, and a little squeezing, will make out a plausible system, and therefore *fifty* plausible systems; for

Digitized by Google

every ingenious student of prophecy must have discoveries of *his own*—every writer must be able to claim something as "my interpretation."

Now all this is wondrously unsatisfactory, and makes plain students of the Word of God, like myself, necessarily futurists, because, in the emphatic words of Horace Bonar, "*we are waiting for further light.*"

The writer of the article in question does not appear to have met in the least the necessities of this class of futurists.

But there is by no means the force of conviction in the arguments which he brings forward against his invisible adversary.

After specifying one of the peculiarities of the system, that the futurist view is the only view on which the predictions could benefit the Church, as prophecy—because in the historical view, it would continually become "fulfilled history," the author remarks,—"It has been wholly useless as *fulfilled* prophecy; and just as useless, for seventeen centuries, as prophecy unfulfilled; while its benefit will have been confined to six or seven writers of our own days, and the small minority of Christians who have faith in their novel principle of interpretation."

This remark is very surprising. It would be sufficient to say that in the futurist principles the *whole prophecy* is as useful to the Church at large, as each separate portion was until its fulfilment (on the historic principle), and surely these prophecies have not been useless until their fulfilment? Why "six or seven writers" have been singled out as the sole recipients of benefit I know not, but I should say, the main usefulness of the prophecy has been *to keep alive the expectation and hope of the Church in all ages;* and this it has answered abundantly on the futurist principle. It is for your author to show that the Church has ever been benefited by its confidence in the supposed *fulfilment* of any portion of the Apocalypse; to me it appears, that there has never been that strong confidence in the actual fulfilment, which could enable the Church so to use it. We look to the bare rock, in the midst of the sea, where Tyre once stood, and nothing can then overthrow our trust in the truth of the Word of God, which foretold its downfall; but how different the degree of confidence wherewith we regard the drying up of the Euphrates, in the gradual wasting of the Turkish empire. Of the one there is no doubt, of the other there is great doubt.

It would occupy too much of your valuable space and your reader's time for me to remark upon the following arguments. I will only add a word or two on the seventh argument, on the phrase, "I was in the Spirit in the Lord's-day." The futurist view supposes that "the Lord's-day" means that day so often spoken of as "the day of the Lord." Their opponents allege, that it means only the Christian Sabbath. The latter your author asserts to be "the simple and natural sense." This is just the question. It is well known that the word κυριακος is not classical Greek—that it occurs but twice in the New Testament, and, therefore, we have the most slender possible grounds for argument from analogy. I will add a few suggestions, to shew that the assumption, that the great day of the Lord is meant, is not altogether unreasonable.

1. If it had been intended to signify the day of the week *on* which an event took place, the proposition should have been ἐπὶ and not ἐν. The latter preposition signifies "in the midst of," and is frequently used in connexion with σαββασι, when it signifies "in the midst of the Sabbath." In fact, the time at which a thing occurs is most frequently expressed in the New Testament by the dative, without a preposition. It seems, therefore, far from unnatural to conclude that here it signifies "*in* the day of the Lord."

2. If St. John meant only to signify that he received his visions on the Sabbath, there is no conceivable reason why he should lay so much stress upon this fact. Had he said, "on *a certain* Lord's day," it would have been different; or, had the Lord's-day—that is, the Sabbath-day—come but seldom, it would have been less singular. But when we remember that it comes *every week*, it seems an *unemphatic emphasis* to say, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's-day," as unnatural as if I were to speak of time spent in London years back, and say, "I was in London on the Sunday." This would have been nothing singular had I said, "on a certain Sunday," but in the Greek this would require τινί.

Digitized by Google

3. There is no justice in the remark, quoted from Mr. Elliott, "that it sets language, grammar, and context alike at defiance." I do not think much of the accuracy of the Greek of the Apocalypse; but, certainly, grammar would require, if the English is to be—"I was in the Spirit *on* the Lord's-day"—that the Greek should be, 'εν πνέυματι τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

My previous remark will justify the use of this phraseology, as far as *language* is concerned. The question of the *context* is too wide for present discussion. But I am surprised that our friends of the Protestant school should venture to knock down this argument, on the score of its *novelty!* Is it not their own view, so elaborately argued by Mr. Birks, that a mystery was to hang about the truth, not to be unravelled, till the time of the end? On this theory, it was to be expected that the true view of this passage should not be developed, till the time of its accomplishment was drawing nigh. None are more ready to overthrow the value of the views of the early Church, than our Protestant friends, when they do not tally with their own.

4. Your author says, "No instance has been adduced of κυριακὴ ἡμέρα, for the day of judgment." Very true; it is used but this once in Scripture; and it is not a classical word. We have no material for controversy on this point. Granting fully its after use in ecclesiastical writers to be in the sense of the first day of the week, we have not the smallest reason to think that such was the phraseology in the days of the apostle; but quite the contrary. Again, it is added, "*No instance is found in all Scripture, where a prophet speaks of himself, or is spoken of by others, as transported into a distant time.* Perhaps not, with this exception; but, surely, we all must allow that John speaks of himself, as transported into a distant time, when he says, "I saw a great white throne," &c. (Rev. xx. 12.) For that concerns events that have not yet happened,—and, therefore, he must have been transported into a time posterior to his own lifetime, by 2000 or 3000 years. Your author will say, "he saw them in vision." I contend, that he saw them ἐν πνέυματι. And in the same sense, was he "in the Spirit, in the day of the Lord."

5. Into the question of the seven churches I do not now enter, but will only remark, that there is enough of obscurity about them to make our opponents cautious in their expositions. When they can neither tell us who the Nicolaitanes were, nor who Antipas was, nor who the woman Jezebel was, when they can find no trace of these in history, except doubtful allusions to a sect of the Nicolaitanes, there is ground enough to make them pause, and hesitate to call all "absurd" which controverts their views. Nevertheless, the messages to the Churches are so distinct from the vision, so separated in the very wording of Rev. i. 19, that we are not driven to the necessity of supposing the Churches to be still future. In one point I agree with the sentiments expressed in your pages. The criticism "the seven churches, not *which are* in Asia" (because 'ουσαις is omitted), I think decidedly erroneous; we can imply nothing from this omission, for it is not an omission, the phrase can be translated "*which are in Asia*," and nothing else.

6. But the next remark, "the new construction violates the Greek idiom," is very erroneous. We are not required to introduce the idea of a verb of motion into the sentence. It is unnecessary to paraphrase the passage, "I was translated by the Spirit into the day of the Lord." As it stands, it asserts a simple fact. And this usage is quite compatible with Greek idiom.

7. The writer of this article makes too light of the value of the testimony of 1 Cor. iii. 13 connected with 1 Cor. iv. 3. The phrase "man's day," is singular and original, and it cannot be supposed to have been adopted by the apostle, except in contrast with the day of the Lord, spoken of before. Now the argument is, if man's day may be spoken of as ἀνθρωπίνη ἡμέρα instead of ἡμέρα ἀνθρώπου, therefore the day of the Lord may also be expressed by the phrase κυριακὴ ἡμέρα, instead of ἡμέρα Κυρίου. The way in which the force of the phrase ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας is explained away by your author is ingenious, but very inaccurate. Surely when the apostle says, "It is a small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment," he does not embody the idea of every separate judgment that each man might choose to form, but collects the whole

Digitized by Google

into one idea, and calls it "man's judgment," that estimate which the world might form of his conduct; and this is *collective* and not *distributive*.

But I have done, and, I fear, have already wearied any reader who may have done me the favour to read thus far. I have only to ask our brethren, in conclusion, that they will extend to us that consideration they have so long demanded from the anti-Millenarian world;—we should not be treated as if we were *a species of heretics*, because we venture to think that their forced interpretations of prophecy are wrong. We have no desire to oppose them, for opposition sake,—if we *could* see with them, we *would;* but it is not wonderful that we cannot,—for, except in a few leading principles, they cannot *see with one another*,—they agree with each other that the Apocalypse is fulfilled up to a certain point, but when they come to sort the events out into their places, they are at utter variance, so that to make a harmony of their fulfilled prophecy is a moral impossibility. Let us wait—let us search—let us pray for further light; and, in the meanwhile, in lowliness of mind, let us each esteem others better than ourselves. I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

Matlock, Bath, November 8, 1848. WILLIAM GIBBS BARKER.

On the above letter of our esteemed brother, we offer a few remarks, thanking him, at the same time, for the spirit in which he writes.

1. As to the two witnesses. To say that Elijah is to come before the great day of the Lord, and to say that he is one of the Apocalyptic witnesses, are two very different things indeed. We cannot see the force of the argument which would infer from Elijah's being to come, that, *therefore*, he must be one of these witnesses. Malachi's description of what he is to do is so totally different from the Apocalyptic description of what the witnesses are to do, that we are surprised that they should be compared. Farther, it seems to us very far short of *proof*, indeed, to say that, because Elijah shut heaven for three and a half years, and the witnesses are to have power to do the same, *therefore* Elijah must be one of the witnesses. That they are to do what Elijah did is surely no proof that one of them is to be Elijah. Could it be shewn that when he comes he is to do what they are said to do, then there would be proof. When Moses told Israel that God would raise them up a prophet like unto him, could they have supposed him to mean that he himself was to return in after-ages? If Elijah is to be slain, how is he (as is generally understood) the type of the living saints who taste not death? And can glorified beings really be slain? Can resurrection bodies, such as Moses' must be if he be one of the witnesses, be slain? If Elijah is to be slain, after he has finished his testimony, how does this correspond with the *success* which his mission is to meet with in turning the hearts of the parents to the children? The witnesses meet with no success, Elijah does; their testimony is rejected, his is received; he comes *before* the great day of the Lord, they (according to our futurist brethren) *in* that day; he comes to save the earth from being smitten with a curse, they come to smite it with a curse. How is it possible that they and he can be the same?

2. As to Antichrist. We believe in an Infidel Antichrist, but not a *purely* Infidel one. This is the difference between us. Just as Rome Papal is constructed out of the ruins of Rome Pagan, so Rome Infidel is to be constructed out of the ruins of Rome Papal. She is to be Infidel at heart, but with some shew of religion.

3. As to the futurists. They point to the discordant views of their opponents, and ask, is it possible that the Apocalypse can be fulfilled? This is no argument. There is much diversity as to the interpretation of Daniel's four empires,—more as to the seventy weeks; but are we to say, that *therefore*, both of these are unfulfilled? Besides, the futurists are just as thoroughly discordant among themselves as the others. Take Mr. Newton and Mr. Darby as examples. If there are not "fifty plausible systems" among them, it is because their theory is as yet recent. In a few years, they will not be able to speak of the endless discrepancies of others. Each of them has a theory, a system, an interpretation, just as much as the others.

4. As to *on* the Lord's-day, we admit that the dative without the preposition

is frequently used, not only in the New Testament, but in the Septuagint, for expressing the time at which a thing occurs; but we are not disposed to allow, that if it had been intended to signify the day of the week, the preposition should have been ἐπὶ and not ἐν. It is curious to observe, that in Ezekiel xl. 1, where the scene and words are very much parallel to Rev. i., the preposition ἐν occurs in a way, which shows us that it has precisely the same force as the *dative;* "in (ἐν) the five-and-twentieth year of our captivity, in (ἐν) the beginning of the year, in (dative, not preposition) the tenth day of the month, in (ἐν) the fourteenth year after that the city was smitten, in (ἐν) the self-same day the hand of the Lord was upon me and brought me hither; in the visions of God brought he me into the land of Israel." Is it not plain from the above passage, that ἐν and the dative are interchangeable, and that they both do "signify the day of the week *on* which the event took place?" In the New Testament, there are numerous examples of this. We cite a few,—Matt. xxiv. 20, "neither on (ἐν) the Sabbath-day;" Luke i. 59, "it came to pass on (ἐν) the eighth day;" Luke viii. 20, "it came to pass on (ἐν) a certain day;" John vii. 37, "in (ἐν) the last day, that great day." Similar expressions are very numerous. Surely our brother had forgotten these, when he penned remarks first and third.

5. As to the Seven Churches. Even if we could not tell who the Nicolaitanes were, or who Antipas and Jezebel were, we should be disposed to say, that is no argument for the Churches being future. How would it be borne, if we were reasoning thus in reference to the names in the First Book of Chronicles? Were we to say, "the personages registered must be future, because we know not who Jabez was, or who was 'Joab, the father of the valley of Charashim;' or who was 'Hurai, of the brooks of Gaash,'" what would be thought of our reasoning?

In a subsequent note, Mr. Barker thus writes:—"I have an impression on my mind, that in the letter which I sent you some little time since, for insertion in the "Prophetic Journal," if you think good, I spoke of the phrase κυριακη ημερα in such a way, that a reader might suppose, that I thought all the messages to the seven Churches to be messages to the future Churches,—and in alluding to the Nicolaitanes, I spoke of them too much, as if they were altogether unknown. Not having a copy of my letter by me, I cannot be specific, but either of these views would give a very false impression of my real sentiments. I believe the Epistles to the seven Churches, to have been addressed to the Churches in Asia of that day; but the idea of the opposite party is not so wholly without support from Scripture, as some would have it. With respect to κυριακη ἡμερα, I have great doubt; there is much to be said on either side, and we have scarcely any help from Greek criticism. As to the Nicolaitanes, I am well aware that the sect was known,—but what I meant to convey was, that its origin, its founder, and its specific tenets were but little known." All that we have time to add on this is, that it is singular that the Septuagint, in which the expression, 'day of the Lord' occurs so often, should *never* once use κυριακος, but *always* ημερα Κυριου. Thus, Isaiah ii. 12, ἡμερα γαρ Κυριου σαββαωθ; xiii. 6, εγγυς γαρ ημερα Κυριου; xiii. 9, ἡμερα Κυριου ερχεται; Joel i. 2, εγγυς η ημερα Κυριου. It is no less singular, that the day of the Lord (meaning the day of his coming) should occur so often in the New Testament, and yet κυριακος is *never* used. With these facts before us, we do not feel at liberty to admit that "much can be said on both sides, and we have scarcely any help from Greek criticism." Mr. Barker cannot produce a single instance in the Old or New Testament, in which the day of the Lord's coming is ever denoted by κυριακη ημερα. We can produce hundreds to show when Scripture wishes to speak of the day of the Advent, it uses ημερα Κυριου; and what more natural, what more *irresistible* than the conclusion, that, whatever κυριακη ημερα may mean, it *cannot* mean the day of the Advent, otherwise it would run entirely counter to the whole usage of Scripture. Besides, the form or mode of expression is a common one in the New Testament; as for instance, Rev. xvi. 14, "the day of God," where it is not the adjective, but the two substantives; 1 John iv. 17, "the day of judgment," where again the adjective is not used; 1 Pet. ii. 12, "the day of visitation;" James v. 5, "a day of slaughter;" Heb. v. 7, "the days of his flesh;" iii. 8, "the day of tempta-

Digitized by Google

tion;" Eph. iv. 30, "the day of redemption;" 2 Cor. vi. 2, "the day of salvation;" Rom. ii. 5, "the day of wrath." In all of which instances, and many others, the same form of speech is observable. So that the use of the adjective in Rev. i. 10, is quite a singular thing, and must denote something new, something peculiar, something for denoting which a new adjective must be used, as the case of the Lord's Supper. The great argument of our brother, Mr. Kelly (whose letter we also give, though we have no time to comment upon it), is the apostle's use of *ανθρωπινη ημερα* in 1 Cor. iv. 3, to which he thinks that *κυριακη ημερα* is designed as a contrast. But is it not remarkable, that the very apostle who gives us the expression, "man's day," gives us also the contrast to it three times over in these epistles to the Corinthians; and the contrast is *not κυριακη ἡμερα,* but the two nouns, as follow:—1 Cor. i. 8, *ἐν τη ημερα τοῦ Κυριου ἡμων*; v. 5, *ἐν τῇ ἡμερα του Κυριου Ιησὸυ*; 2 Cor. i. 14, *ἐν τη ἡμερα τοῦ Κυριου Ιησου.* This does appear to us quite decisive, and we feel constrained to say, that we do wonder at Mr. Barker's statement—"much may be said on either side." We have read the statements of Mr. Maitland, Dr. Todd, and Mr. Kelly, and we have not only been left unconvinced, but we have felt at a loss to understand how such decided conclusions should be ventured on from such extremely slender grounds.

We have not touched upon all the points noticed by Mr. Barker. We have not space, but we have taken the more prominent. We shall have future opportunities of discussing the whole subject.

(To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy.")

Sir,—As a very humble student of the prophetic word, permit me to accord my thanks to you for the issue of the journal, for I have long time wished such a work could be published; above all, I would thank God that he has given you the spirit of wisdom and prudence as testified by the articles appearing in it. May He vouchsafe to continue this to you in an abundant manner. As bearing upon your remarks in Letter II. to an Inquirer, would it not be desirable to illustrate and explain in the Journal the figurative language of prophecy, especially as relates to the heavenly bodies, used in so many places in Scripture as symbols? I am not aware I have ever seen the point alluded to, but it has forcibly struck my mind, that *one* of the Almighty's designs in creating the heavenly orbs was, that they should be used as symbols in instructing man from the prophetic page. For we read in Genesis i. 14, "Let them be for *signs* and for seasons, and for days and years." If this idea be a correct one, you may deem it worthy of further attention. I will add that once I was a Post-Millennialist, not because I could prove that view from the Bible, but because it was the popular opinion, and, I regret to say, that so often brought before us at missionary meetings, the words of Christ in Luke xvii. 26—30, first arrested my attention. I felt their irreconcileableness with my views. I read the Word with the new light now opened upon me. The result was, a full and confident belief in the Pre-Millennial Advent of my Lord and Saviour. Oh, that every Christian would, laying aside the opinions of men, meekly sit to learn of the Lord "his ways upon earth," his "theory of the world."

I am, respectfully yours,

October 30, 1848. W. H.

(To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy.")

York, Nov. 22, 1848.

Sir,—Having lately been at Scarborough, I purchased at a bookseller's shop in that town the inclosed Tract, from which it appears that the writer was expelled from his office of local preacher among the Wesleyan Methodists for holding and teaching our Lord's Pre-Millennnial Advent. Hence it would seem that this doctrine does not meet with much toleration in the Wesleyan body at the present day, notwithstanding the recorded adherence to it both of Fletcher and of Charles Wesley. Thanks to our God, the liberty of preaching this solemnly important

Digitized by Google

truth is still enjoyed by the ministers of the Church of England, and embraced, I trust, by a continually increasing number, whose minds have been opened to its reception. I send the tract that you may notice it in your next number if you should think fit.

I hope I may be pardoned for taking the liberty to add, that it would be of great advantage to inquirers like myself if you would give us not only reviews and brief notices of new publications, but also short characters of works which, though they may have been for some time published, are well fitted, through God's blessing, to inform and instruct the mind on prophetic and Millenarian subjects. A guide to the choice of books for profitable reading on these deeply interesting topics would doubtless be useful to many.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

A Learner.

Note.—We give the title of the pamphlet referred to by our Correspondent:—"The Second Appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Judgment by Him, introductory to the Millennium, or Universal Earthly Blessedness: a Letter to the Rev. John Walsh, Wesleyan Minister, Scarborough; to which is added, a few Prefatory Remarks and Answers to Objections; especially addressed to Wesleyan Methodists. By a late Local Preacher amongst them. 'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.' (1 Thess. v. 21.)" We add also an extract:—

"Let us look at the leading arguments afterwards mentioned, and enlarge upon them a little. These are three. 1. The Scriptures do not assert the world's conversion by the preaching of the Gospel alone. 2. They most plainly tell us evil shall continue until the second coming of the Lord. 3. They as plainly declare the introduction of the world's blessedness by the Lord's coming.

"I will say a little to the first and second. That the Gospel must be preached to *all nations*, I grant. That it was commanded to be preached to *every creature*, is equally true. But it does not follow from either of these, that all will be converted by it. Has not the Gospel been preached more or less to almost every creature in England? Has not the Gospel been preached, *at least in some* towns and villages, faithfully for years? Is our nation converted? Have we a converted town or village? Alas! no. On the contrary, our national guilt cries daily to heaven for vengeance. If then the Gospel *has not* done it in one of the least parts, how can we expect it will do it in the whole? The Gospel is now being preached perhaps as it never was before, in all the nations of the earth; and this to me is a sign, not of the earth's conversion being near, but of *the end* being near. 'And this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world *for a witness to all nations, and then shall the end come.*' (Matt. xxiv. 14.)

"But wickedness and apostasy shall continue up to the Lord's coming. Oh! this apostasy spoils all. What *might* have been done if this had not stood in the *way*, I know not! But we have here an opposing power which nothing shall be able to overcome and put an end to, but *the Lord Himself.* From 2 Thess. ii. 3—8, it is plain that the falling away, the mystery of iniquity, and the man of sin, take up all the course of time, from the apostles down to the Lord's coming. The man of sin shall "be *consumed* by the spirit of his mouth, *and destroyed by the brightness of his coming:*' and destruction is not conversion. This is the *personal Advent.* (Chap. i. 7—10.) We find, then, no room for a Millennium before the Lord comes; the world, therefore, must continue in existence after his coming."

"I hold the place of Christ and his risen saints, during the Millennium, to be not *on the earth*, but in the heavens: the kingdom during the Millennium will be twofold, viz., heavenly and earthly. The Church with Christ will possess the heavenly part of the kingdom; there all will be *perfect, immortal, undying and eternal felicity.* In the earthly part of the kingdom, over which Christ and the Church will reign, there will in part be imperfection, its inhabitants will still be in mortal bodies, and liable to death," &c.

Digitized by Google

(To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy.")

Sir,—As the interpretation of the Apocalypse is the subject to which students of prophecy must necessarily in the present day direct their chief attention, I was much pleased to observe in your first number a letter from Mr. Frere, putting very distinctly before your readers a point of great importance for the right arrangement of the visions of that book.

Although I have not directed my attention to prophecy for so long a period as Mr. Frere has done, yet it is now a good many years since the Apocalypse became the subject of very earnest study, and I trust, therefore, that I may escape the imputation of rashness, if I venture to notice one point on which I feel constrained to differ from him.

While I agree with Mr. Frere, in thinking that a right division of the Apocalyptic visions into three series lies at the very root of a correct interpretation, I am not able to discern the propriety of designating one of these series, by the name of "the little opened book." I would call it the "history of the 1260 days;" and I shall shortly give my reasons for this amendment, which is more than a mere difference of nomenclature.

I.—I can perceive no ground whatever for connecting the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth chapters, containing the visions of the "two witnesses," of the "Dragon" and of the "Seven-headed Beast," with the tenth chapter, which contains the vision of the "little opened book." To the readers of our English version there appears indeed to be such a connexion, because the eleventh chapter opens with the words, "And there was given me a reed like unto a rod: *and the angel stood*, saying." So that the speaker appears to be the same angel who in the preceding chapter holds the little book in his hand. But, I believe, it is admitted on all hands, that the words which I have put into italics, "and the angel stood," are wanting in the most correct copies of the Greek text; and if these be omitted, there remains not the least pretext for connecting the one vision with the other.

II.—It has always appeared to me that there was something incongruous, in making the action of the prophet in measuring the temple, and two visions which have their own separate localities assigned to them, to be the contents of a book in the hand of the angel.

III.—Another interpretation of the little book is so simple, and so accordant, in my view, with the remainder of the prophecy, that ever since I first saw it suggested (I forget where), I have not hesitated to adopt it. The little book, I conceive, is the seven-sealed book of a former vision, with six portions of it, contained under the first six seals, unrolled and removed. It is, therefore, a *little* book when compared with the former, and is *opened* (not *open*) because the seventh seal has already been unloosed, although the contents of that portion of the roll have not yet been made known to the apostle.

IV.—Supposing that this little book is the seventh seal, I find that the adjuncts of the vision remarkably agree with this view of its character. The first six seals are opened by Christ in the character of the "Lamb that had been slain," the seventh belongs to him in his character of the "Lion of the tribe of Judah," for this, I think, is denoted by the mighty angel crying with a loud voice, *as when a lion roareth.* Now, Christ assumes the character of the lion, only when he begins his work of judgment, and this he does on the opening of the seventh seal. Again, the angel sets one foot on the sea, and the other on the earth, being an emblematic act, signifying his taking possession of the world: and it is at the opening of the seventh seal that the kingdoms of the earth become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. The rainbow round the angel's head, and the manner of the oath which he swears, "by him that created heaven and earth," agree perfectly with this symbolic action. And, lastly, the synchronism between the seventh seal and seventh trumpet, explains much more satisfactorily than any other interpretation how it is, that although the angel swears, Ὅτι χρόνος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι, he declares in the same breath that the mystery of God shall be finished in the days of the voice of the seventh angel; and it accounts also for the sealing of the contents of the little book, that is,

Digitized by Google

the seven thunders, for they are identical with the seven vials which fill up the space of the seventh trumpet.

The above is, of course, the barest possible outline of an argument, my object being merely to direct the attention of students of prophecy to a point which is certainly of great importance in interpreting the Apocalypse. It will be observed, that I by no means controvert the position that there are three parallel series of visions, for there I agree with Mr. Frere ; I would merely remove the tenth chapter from the beginning of the third series where he places it, to the end of the first. The third series of visions may receive the appropriate designation of the history of the 1260 years, although, strictly speaking, it contains also events which precede, and events which follow that era.

I remain, &c. W. W.

(*To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."*)

SIR,—May I request the favour of knowing, through the medium of your next number of "The Prophetical Journal," the opinion you entertain of "The Scripture Chronology of the World," published at the end of Mr. Dallas' "Revelation Readings." What are the "*recent* researches" he speaks of? and by whom made? I also take the liberty of asking the following questions:—

"And he shall *send* Jesus Christ, whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of ALL things." (Acts iii. 20, 21.) Can this be before the last day?

If the first resurrection is that *of all believers*, and the second, at the end of the Millennium, that of unbelievers; and if the Jews during the Millennium are to live on earth *as believers*, when are *they* to rise? Are they ever or never to *join* the glorified risen saints who reign in the New Jerusalem *over* the earth?

I remain, your obedient Servant,

London, *Nov.* 27, 1848. A YOUNG STUDENT OF PROPHECY.

---

1. We decline giving a decided opinion on Mr. Dallas' Chronology. We have not been able to investigate its details so fully, as to entitle us to speak with decision. Nor is it easy to do so, as Mr. Dallas merely gives us *results*, not the processes by which these were reached. We cannot say what are the "recent researches" to which Mr. Dallas alludes. Of late, chronology has been much, and most thoroughly studied. Several works on it have been published. There is the able work of the *Duke of Manchester*. There is *Mr. Browne's* "*Ordo Sæclorum.*" There is *Greswell's* work on chronology. There is *Bosanquet's* recent volume, which we have not yet seen.

2. If, as we believe, the Millennial age be the "times of the restitution of all things," then the Advent of the Lord must be Pre-Millennial. We suspect that our correspondent does not fully understand the question that he puts. Does he mean to say, that Christ is to remain in heaven till *after* the last day? All, whether past or Pre-Millennial, believe that he comes to *introduce* the last day; —the difference being as to what the last day is. As to the meaning of restitution, we shall say nothing here. We shall (D. V.) take another opportunity of entering upon this, and showing how utterly unfounded is the assertion of Mr. Faber, that the meaning we attach to it would never have been thought of, "had not the construction of a system required it."—*Eight Dissertations*, vol. i. p. 8, *note*. What system had Bretschneider in view, when he declared for our interpretation? What system had Wicliffe, Tyndale, Cranmer, &c., *all* the translators of *all* the various versions of our English Bible, in view, when they rendered it as we do? What system had Beza in view, when he translated it, *usque ad tempora restitutiones omnium, de quibus locutus est Deus*; or what system had Lampe, Teller, Doddridge, &c., in view, when they interpreted it precisely as we do? But we cannot discuss this at present, though we shall say this, that Mr. Faber's statement is unfair and incorrect.

3. God has not revealed his purpose in reference to the ultimate condition of Israel. Some have gone into conjectures as to it, we shall not. We are satisfied to be ignorant of what God has not made known.

Digitized by Google

PASSING THROUGH.

"Pass the time of your sojourning here in fear."—1 Pet. ii. 17.

I.

I WALK as one who knows that he is treading
A stranger-soil;
As one round whom a serpent-world is spreading
Its subtle coil.

II.

I walk as one but yesterday deliver'd
From a sharp chain;
Who trembles lest the bond so newly sever'd
Be bound again.

III.

I walk as one who feels that he is breathing
Ungenial air;
For whom, as wiles, the tempter still is wreathing
The bright and fair.

IV.

My steps, I know, are on the plains of danger,
For sin is near;
But looking up, I pass along, a stranger,
In haste and fear.

V.

This earth has lost its power to drag me downward,—
Its spell is gone;
My course is now right upward, and right onward,
To yonder throne.

VI.

Hour after hour of time's dark night is stealing
In gloom away;—
Speed Thy fair dawn of light and joy and healing,
Thou Star of day!

VII.

For thee, its God, its King, the long-rejected,
Earth groans and cries:
For thee the long-beloved, the long-expected,
Thy bride still sighs!*

* "Illum absens absentem auditque videtque."—*Virg.*

NOTICE.

ALL contributions to be addressed to the Publishers, with the Author's name, either attached or given separately. Contributors and correspondents are requested to condense their remarks as much as possible, our space being limited. One or two contributions, which we had hoped to give in the present Number, have been unavoidably postponed. Books for review, whether on prophecy or not, are requested to be sent as early as possible. Several works which we should gladly have noticed, have arrived too late for this quarter.

All readers of this Journal are most earnestly besought to give it room in their prayers; that by means of it God may be honoured and his truth advanced: also, that it may be conducted in faith and love, with sobriety of judgment and discernment of the truth, in nothing carried away into error, or hasty speech, or sharp unbrotherly disputation.

ERRATA.

At page 78, line 10, for *these* read *there*.
,, 79, line 22, for *sense* read *verse*.
,, 87, line 24, for *precious* read *gracious*.
At page 87, line 28, for *New* read *Old*.
,, 104, line 4, for *on* read *yon*.

Macintosh, Printer, Great New-street, London.

Digitized by Google

THE QUARTERLY

JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

APRIL, 1849.

Art. I.—THE GREEK TEXT OF THE APOCALYPSE.

In the critical study of the Word of God, we need to remember that we can claim the authority of verbal inspiration for the *original alone.*

Every translation becomes, *in some sense,* a commentary on the original; and though a translation, from its exceeding correctness, may sometimes claim a very high authority; yet, on disputed questions, it is necessary to refer to the original.

But what is *the original?* Strictly speaking, none can claim that title except that copy, long since lost, of each part of the Word of God, which came direct from the hand of the inspired penman, and was, therefore, an exact transcript of the mind of the Author.

It is needless to add, that we have not in one single instance such an original; the lapse of ages, the accidents of circumstances—perhaps even the course of natural decay,—*must* have robbed *us,* who live in these later ages of the Church, of that inestimable treasure which we should have felt these originals to be, had we possessed them. To our judgment this would seem best—to Infinite Wisdom it seemed otherwise. Hereafter we shall know the reason why.

Nevertheless, the existence of many ancient MSS. of the Scriptures, in all of which a *general,* though not *universal* verbal agreement is found, supplies to us in a great measure the loss of the originals.

Those parts of the MSS. which are uniformly in agreement, may be without hesitation affirmed to be true copies of the original; and many various readings of these MSS., *when compared with one another,* serve to bring out the true

Digitized by Google

reading on the surest testimony. It is necessary, in endeavouring to supply the place of the lost originals by faithful copies of those originals, to use the utmost diligence, and institute the most rigid examination of the MSS. that remain, in order to bring forth from them a copy of the Word of God which may, next to the absolute originals, claim to be considered "the inspired Word of God."

The devout student will rise from his task with this conviction on his mind:—that, although the *verbal* variations are almost endless, yet the passages whose sense is affected by these variations are *very few;* and the doctrinal truths that the Bible teaches are, almost without exception, left uninjured by them; so wonderfully has God provided that his inspired Word should be handed down to us, with all the signs of the *fallibility* of the hands through which it has passed, but with all the proofs of the *infallibility* of Him who gave the revelation of His will, as clear and decisive as they were in the day in which they were first given.

So does many a time-honoured temple of the living God now stand, rearing its lofty pinnacles which have withstood the summers and winters of a thousand years,—their corners indeed rounded, the surface roughened, but their stability unshaken by the lapse of centuries.

The particular portion of the inspired Word of God which is the subject of this article, possesses much interest for the biblical student, apart from the peculiar subject which is treated of throughout its pages; and although the interpretation of it will not be to any extent affected by the researches we can make into the original, yet it seems highly desirable to understand how far the version we now have of the Revelation may be regarded as a faithful version of the original; and what are the changes which the evidence of the MSS. that have been collated would oblige us to make. We shall therefore venture some further remarks,

I. On the peculiar dialect, or idiom, of the original text.

II. On the state of the text, with our materials for correcting it.

III. On the readings that seem preferable, and the bearing of the change on the general interpretation of the Apocalypse.

I. On the peculiar dialect, or idiom, of the original text.

A student of the ancient Greek classics, when he applies himself to the study of the Greek Testament, is struck with

Digitized by Google

its remarkable peculiarities, both of construction and expression. Some have imputed to its authors solecisms, or instances of bad grammar; but more cautious critics have accounted for all the peculiarities of style and construction, by asserting, that the authors wrote in *Hellenistic* Greek, and were men of *Hebrew* birth, habit, and descent.

Hellenist Jews were Jews who dwelt among the Greeks, or those who spoke the Greek language; and *Hellenistic Greek* would be understood to signify the language spoken among them; men who had acquired their knowledge of Greek rather by practice than by grammar, and who would infuse into the language, in some measure, the idiom of their native tongue. Such were the authors, and, to a great extent, the readers likewise, of the books of the New Testament when first published.

The Greek text of the Apocalypse is considered to be as deeply tinged with the Hellenistic idiom, and to abound with Hebraisms, as much as any book of the New Testament. That many of its expressions are peculiar, and its phrases are shaped but little after the model of the best Greek authors, will readily appear from a few examples.

1. Rev. i. 4. *τῶν ἑπτὰ πνευμάτων ἃ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ,* is the reading of most MSS. The "received text" has *ἅ ἐστιν ἐνώπιον.* Both are equally unclassical: it should have been *τῶν ἐνώπιον, κ. τ. λ.,* which is, in fact, the reading of two MSS.

2. Rev. i. 12. *τὴν φωνὴν ἥτις ἐλάλει,* should more properly have been, *τὴν φωνὴν τὴν λαλοῦσαν.* A similar usage is found in Rev. ii. 2, 7.

3. Rev. ii. 20. *Ιεζαβὴλ ἡ λέγουσα,* should have been, *τὴν λέγουσαν.* A similar case occurs in Rev. iii. 12, in reference to the new Jerusalem.

4. Rev. vii. 9. The whole phrase, *καὶ ἰδοὺ ὄχλος πολὺς,* is unclassical. The usage of the *καὶ* in this manner is derived from the Hebrew; so, in a great measure, the word *ἰδοὺ*; and *ὄχλος πολὺς* should have been in the accusative.

5. Rev. viii. 9. *τὰ ἔχοντα ψυχὰς,* should have been, *τῶν ἐχόντων.* Rev. ix. 14. *ἀγγέλῳ ὁ ἔχων,* should have been *τῷ ἔχοντι.*

6. Rev. xiv. 12. In the "received text," the word *ὧδε* is inserted before *οἱ τηροῦντες*; but this is rejected on the authority of almost all the MSS. And then we have another instance of this unclassical usage, which should have been, *τῶν τηρούντων.* A like expression is found in Rev. xvii. 4, *τὰ ἀκάθαρτα,* instead of *τῶν ἀκαθάρτων.*

Digitized by Google

Many instances of a like nature might easily be added; but these are sufficient to show the departure, in what is called the Hellenistic idiom, from the rules that seem to have governed the purer classical style of the best Greek authors. It is probable however that this was in entire accordance with the usages of the common people of those countries in which the Scriptures were first circulated, and the authors of the New Testament are in this respect open to no charge of inaccuracy in their style.

There are, however, in the Apocalypse many peculiarities of expression that may more distinctly be traced to the author's Hebrew mode of thinking and writing; and these are more properly termed *Hebraisms*. Such are the following:—

1. Rev. i. 4. The true reading of the middle clause is, *ἀπὸ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*; and although the "received text" inserts *τοῦ* after the *ἀπὸ*, to give some colour of a genitive to be governed by the preposition, yet no good MS. supports it; and thus we regard this as an undoubted Hebraism, in which the words are treated as though there were no distinctions of case.

2. Rev. i. 5, furnishes a similar instance: *Χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς*, where the nominative is used, though in apposition with a genitive. This the Hebrew idiom may admit, but it is quite at variance with the Greek.

3. Rev. i. 6. The phrase, *βασιλείαν ἱερεῖς*, is a Hebraism. It is borrowed from Exod. xix. 6, where the expression is, "a kingdom of priests," and the apostle has, according to Hebrew usage, omitted to change *ἱερεῖς* to the genitive. The reading of the "received text," *βασιλεῖς καὶ ἱερεῖς*, is almost without the authority of any MSS.

4. It is impossible not to be struck with the very frequent use of the conjunction, *καὶ*, in this book. The more customary classical words are the well-known *μὲν* and *δὲ*; of these there is a tolerable sprinkling throughout the other books of the New Testament; but the word *μὲν* is not once used throughout the Apocalypse, and *δὲ* very seldom. The first eight chapters furnish four instances of the usage of *δὲ*, whilst *καὶ* is used in the same chapters 374 times! This is usually regarded as a Hebraistic peculiarity, the use of the *καὶ* corresponding to that of the Hebrew particle, *vau*.

5. The frequent use of the Hebrew words, *ἀμὴν, οὐαὶ*, with the Hebrew terminations, whenever words in that language are introduced, marks the author as one of Hebrew

Digitized by Google

birth and education; with whom Greek is the adopted, not the native tongue.

6. Other examples of Hebrew usage may be found in Rev. ii. 2, 13; iv. 4; xiii. 3; xiv. 6, 9; xviii. 12; xx. 2; xxi. 12: but the above are sufficient.

Now, the practical result at which we shall naturally arrive from this inquiry is, that in our criticisms on the Apocalypse, it would be wrong to employ the same rules as we should use, were we studying classical Greek. It is impossible to argue concerning peculiarities of Greek construction, with the same confidence which we should have felt, had the author written his work in a pure classical style: we must relax the stringency of rules, to correspond to the laxity of style. We cannot with confidence assert that in Rev. x. 3, *αἱ ἑπτὰ βρονταὶ* refers to thunders *mentioned before;* nor can we declare that in Rev. xvii. 3, *ἐπὶ θηριὸν κόκκινον* refers to a beast that has *not* been mentioned before. We are obliged to believe that a writer, who in far more important particulars neglects the idiom of the language, *may not* have attended to it in these particulars.

Consequently, in our criticisms on such nice points as these, we must take heed that we do not lay too much stress upon them, nor suffer arguments of immense importance to depend upon questions of doubtful solution. Nevertheless, we must not go to the opposite extreme, and suffer ourselves to be betrayed into the folly of calling everything a Hebraism which presents a difficulty in construction, and so getting *our own way* in interpretation by the adoption of this *ruse*. *Honest* criticism is most valuable, but party criticism is a very different and dangerous affair.

We will now bend our inquiries more especially to

II. The State of the Text, with our Materials for Correcting it.

If we believe in the *verbal inspiration* of the Apocalypse, it is obviously of the first importance that we do our best to obtain a correct copy of the original. At first sight this might appear almost hopeless, when we see that the number of various readings amounts to hundreds, and even thousands. But the labours of those learned men who have devoted their lives to this research, although they have greatly increased the number of various readings that have come to light, have also most wonderfully proved the *general accuracy* of the present text of the Apocalypse; for although the actual number of the various readings is enormous, the importance of the variations is singularly small, and the majority

Digitized by Google

of them may clearly be traced to the errors of transcribers, and therefore admit of easy correction.

One of the latest efforts that have been made towards a greater purity of the text of the Apocalypse, is the edition of that book published by Mr. Tregelles, to which we shall shortly refer more fully.

It is hardly necessary to observe that the original MS. of the Apocalypse shared the fate of all the rest; as indeed was inevitably the case by the natural course of decay,—a result probably much hastened by the continual handling of the original, in making the copies which were undoubtedly made; but not only have we no trace of the original; the early copies of it have all shared the same fate; and three MSS. only remain, which can be regarded as really ancient copies of the Apocalypse, viz., the Codex Alexandrinus, now in the British Museum; another MS., now in the Vatican at Rome; and a codex rescriptus, called Codex Ephræmi. The first and last are supposed to have been written in the fifth century, the second in the seventh century.

But the "Received Text" of the Apocalypse, which is that in use in most of the editions of the Greek Testament known in this country, has little to do with these three MSS., having been determined from other sources before their collation. The Cambridge edition follows the text of the third edition of Stevens—1550; while the Oxford edition chiefly follows that of Mill. These may be regarded as having been edited substantially from the last edition of Erasmus, with some corrections from the Complutensian edition: and therefore the editions now commonly in use depend for their readings mainly upon the MSS. which were consulted for these two editions. It seems scarcely probable that the editors of the Complutensian edition were able to consult any very ancient MSS.; those which they collated are said to be preserved in the library of the University of Alcala, in Spain; from the ancient name of which (Complutum) the edition took its name.

With respect to the edition of Erasmus, we know that he had access to one MS. of the Apocalypse only, which is now lost; but, besides other defects, the last six verses were wholly wanting, and these Erasmus supplied by a re-translation from the Latin Vulgate. The mere fact that the editions of the Greek Testament commonly in use, and from which our Authorized Version was made, contain these spurious verses, in whole or in part, will be sufficient apology

Digitized by Google

for attempting a revision of the text of the Apocalypse from the more ancient MSS. to which we have now access.

Mr. Tregelles has arranged his materials for the correction of the text of the Apocalypse, under the following heads:—

1. MSS. of the Revelation.
2. Ancient versions.
3. Quotations from the original by early writers.

Of MSS. he gives a list, comprising three very ancient, distinguished by the letters A, B, C; and ninety-two later MSS., written in *cursive,* or common Greek letters: these again he divides into classes,—

a. Comprising twenty-nine perfect MSS.

β. Twelve partially defective MSS.

γ. Twenty-five MSS., which have only been partially collated.

δ. Twenty-nine MSS., which are altogether uncited.

The ancient versions which contain the Apocalypse are,—the Latin Vulgate, the Coptic, the Æthiopic, the Syriac, the Armenian, the Arabic, the Sclavonic.

Quotations from ancient writers, though valuable in doctrinal matters, are found to be an uncertain source of correction for the text; since it is to be feared they often quoted from mere memory, and therefore would abound in slight variations.

The principles on which the readings have been adopted in this edition, are such as highly to commend it as an authority, being chiefly the following:—

1. *Unanimous* consent of MSS. and versions is a proof of a true reading.
2. Where evidence is not unanimous, the *majority* governs the choice.
3. The ancient MSS. (A, C) have more weight than all the *modern* copies.

Other principles that are subjoined, in some degree modify these, without destroying their general influence; and following these out, we may feel confident that the text which is settled on these principles is nearer to the original than that which is now commonly in use.

But the question which is of most interest is,—To what extent is the version of the Revelation now in use affected or altered by this process? And this we shall now consider under our third division.

III. On the Readings that seem preferable, and the Bearing of the Change on the general Interpretation of the Apocalypse.

Digitized by Google

The various readings of the Apocalypse are numerous, but very few of them are of great importance: the majority may be classed as follows:—

1. The substitution of one case for another.
2. The substitution of one tense for another.
3. The substitution of one preposition for another.
4. A change in the order of the words.
5. The omission of an unimportant word.

The earliest cases that occur of each of these are the following:—

1. Rev. i. 1. *διὰ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννῃ*, is the reading of most MSS.; "He sent and signified it by his angel to his servant John:" but the Alexandrine MS. reads, *τοῦ δούλου*, in which case we should render it, "By the angel his servant to John:" and the alteration is quite unimportant.

2. Rev. i. 5. The reading of the received text is, *ἀγαπήσαντι*, "To him that *loved* us;" but almost every MS. has *ἀγαπῶντι*, "To him that *loveth* us;" which is the better reading, but is of no doctrinal importance.

3. Rev. i. 5. The received text has *ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*; but the larger number of MSS. read *ἐκ* for *ἀπὸ*. The translation is the same.

4. Rev. i. 10. *ἤκουσα ὀπίσω μου φωνὴν* is the common reading; but twenty-five MSS. have the words in the order *φωνὴν ὀπίσω μου*. There is no alteration in the sense by this change of order.

5. Rev. i. 9. The received text reads, *ὁ καὶ ἀδελφὸς*, "who *also* am your brother;" but almost all MSS. reject the "*καὶ, also*." It is of no importance to the sense.

These five specimens may be said to represent five great families of various readings. We shall now proceed to notice some that are of importance to the interpretation of the Scriptures:—

1. Rev. i. 2. The received text reads, *ὅσα τε εἶδε*; and our translation following this, renders it, "And of all things that he saw." But all the three ancient MSS., forty-two later ones, and seven versions, reject the *τε*; and thus *ὅσα* becomes the accusative, governed by *κατὰ*, omitted, and the translation will be, "Concerning as many things as he saw."

2. Rev. i. 6. Instead of *βασιλεῖς καὶ ἱερεῖς*, all the good MSS. read *βασιλείαν ἱερεῖς*,—a kingdom of priests; a Hebraism indeed, but borrowed from Exod. xix. 6, and perhaps corresponding better with the rest of Scripture than the common reading.

Digitized by Google

3. Rev. i. 11. *ταῖς ἐν Ἀσίᾳ*, "which are in Asia." All the three ancient MSS., and forty-one of the later MSS. omit these words; they are evidently introduced from Rev. i. 4, where the words are undisputed.

4. Rev. v. 10. Here are two different readings, which seriously affect the sense. Instead of *ἡμᾶς* in the passage "thou hast made *us* unto our God kings and priests," two of the three ancient MSS., and nearly all the later MSS., have *αὐτοὺς, them.* And, instead of *βασιλεύσομεν*, "we shall reign," the Alexandrine, and fifteen later MSS. read, *βασιλεύουσιν*, "they reign," while eighteen later MSS. read, *βασιλεύσουσιν*, "they shall reign."

It is difficult, however, to see to whom the word "them" is intended to refer, unless we suppose the song to cease at the word "nation," and that which follows, the remark of the Apostle St. John in reference to those who had sung the song.

Rev. vi. 1. *φωνῇ* is the reading of two ancient, and thirty-two later MSS., instead of *φωνῆς*. This will lead us to render the passage, "one of the four beasts saying, as *with* the voice of thunder," which is far plainer than the usual translation.

Rev. viii. 7. In this verse, the whole sentence, *καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς γῆς κατεκάη*, has been omitted in the "received text," but is found in the Alexandrine and a host of later MSS. It has evidently been an omission, caused *δι' ὁμοιοτέλευτον*—the eye of the transcriber having glanced from one *κατεκάη* to the other, and so left out the whole sentence.

Rev. ix. 13. Instead of *ἄγγελος*, an angel, both the ancient MSS., and twenty-six of the later MSS. have *ἀετὸυ*, an eagle. The alteration is more curious than important. It would be difficult to assign any reason wherefore an eagle, in preference to an angel, should be made the messenger of woe.

Rev. ix. 19. There is an important change of reading in this verse. The reading of the received text is, *αἱ γὰρ ἐξουσίαι αὐτῶν*, "their power is in their mouth;" but, by the authority of almost every MS., the reading should be *ἡ ἐξουσία τῶν ἵππων*, "the power of the horses is in their mouth and in their tails,"—a reading which tends to overthrow the idea, that the authority of the Turkish pachas and their horse-tail standards, is intended here.

Rev. xi. 8. Instead of *ἡμῶν*, almost all the MSS. read *αὐτῶν*, "where *their* Lord also was crucified;" that is, the Lord of the witnesses. This seems to signify that the wit-

Digitized by Google

nesses shall die for the truth, where their Lord and Master died for it, viz., at Jerusalem.

Rev. xiii. 1. The reading ἐστάθη, is supported by two of the three ancient MSS., and also by the "Codex Montfortianus;" but it is doubtful whether this is preferable to ἐστάθην. In the former case the nominative is "the dragon," in the latter, "St. John."

Rev. xiv. 5. The closing words, "before the throne of God," have no authority whatever in any MSS. of consequence, and certainly they are not essential to the sense of the passage in which they stand.

Rev. xiv. 8. The words ἡ πόλις, are omitted in all the ancient MSS., and in thirty-five of the later MSS., so that the translation will run, "Babylon the great is fallen."

Rev. xvi. 3. The Alexandrine MS. and the "Codex Ephræmi" insert τὰ after ἀπέθανεν in this verse. This would rather favour the translation, "Every living thing died, as to the things in the sea," as Mr. Tregelles has rendered it, but as no other MSS. support this reading, it must be held to be at least very doubtful.

Rev. xvi. 7. The usual reading here is ἤκουσα ἄλλου ἐκ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, "I heard another out of the altar," but the authority of nearly every MS. is against the ἀλλοῦ ἐκ; so that the translation should be, "I heard the altar say." If so, the altar is here put for the souls under the altar, who, under the fifth seal, are represented as crying to God for vengeance, a cry which now is heard and answered.

Rev. xvii. 8. The reading of the received text, in the close of this verse, is, ὅτι ἦν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι, καίπερ ἐστίν, "the beast which was, and is not, and yet is." But all the ancient MSS., and thirty-two of the later ones, read καὶ πάρεσται, "and shall be present," instead of καίπερ ἐστίν; and six more read καὶ πάρεστιν, "and is present," from which latter reading καίπερ ἐστίν is a manifest corruption, their sound being nearly the same. And if instead of ὅ τι, "which is," we read ὅτι, "because," we shall render the passage, "they shall wonder when they behold the beast, because it was, and is not, and shall be present." This is capable of a very clear explanation, whereas the former translation must ever remain a mystery, if it be not an unexplainable contradiction of terms.

Rev. xviii. 5. In this verse, ἐκολλήθησαν, "her sins have adhered to," instead of ἠκολούθησαν, "have reached," is the reading of most MSS., but the sense is not affected thereby, though the force of the metaphor is somewhat increased.

Digitized by Google

Rev. xxi. 7. The usual reading, πάντα, "shall inherit *all* things," should be ταῦτα, "these things," on the authority of all the ancient, and most of the modern MSS., and the latter reading certainly accords far better both with the context and with the general truth of Scripture.

Rev. xxii. 24. The usual reading of this passage is, "The nations *of them that are saved* shall walk in the light of it;" but the words τῶν σωζομένων, "them that are saved," should be omitted, on the authority of the Alexandrine and thirty-three other MSS. And this will make a material difference in the interpretation of the passage; for, in the first case, the heavenly city is represented merely as the abode of *the saved*, who walk in its light; but the second represents the nations of the millennial world, or the world after the Millennium (according to the interpretation given of the whole passage), living in the light, and walking by means of the light of the heavenly city, which thus becomes the visible link between heaven and the restored earth.

Rev. xxii. 14. The next various reading which we shall notice is a very striking one. The reading of the received text is, ποιοῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, "Blessed are they who do his commandments." But, on the authority of the Alexandrine, the Vatican, and another valuable MS., the reading should be, πλύνοντες τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν, "Blessed are they who wash their robes." This reading takes away the *shadow* of support which the other gave to the notion of justification by works, and places it upon its true ground—faith in the atonement of an all-sufficient Saviour.

Rev. xxii. 19. The mention of the "book" in the earlier part of the verse seems to have led to the reading of the "received text" in this place, where, instead of "book of life," βίβλου τῆς ζωῆς, it ought to be ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς, "the tree of life," on the authority of all the ancient, and thirty-three of the later MSS.; and the omission of the καὶ, which follows πολέως τῆς ἁγίας, on the authority of the Alexandrine, and thirty-one MSS., gives the far more consistent sense of the passage, as follows: "God shall take away his part from the tree of life, and from the holy city, which are written of in this book."

Such are the most important various readings that the collation of the MSS. furnishes us with, and, in conclusion, we cannot but lift up a heart of devout thankfulness to God who has preserved this wondrous book from all serious error in so remarkable a way. We may safely say, that, although there are several passages where the discovery of the true reading has tended to cast a brighter light upon the truth, there is

Digitized by Google

not a single place where that truth was so obscured by the errors of the transcribers, as that it was lost or changed; and when we remember the great natural obscurity of the book—the mysteries whereof it treats—it is nothing short of a miracle to find that so little important variation has taken place in the text. We may study it from the beginning to the end, with the general conviction, that we have before us an *essentially* faithful copy of that original, which came forth from the mouth of God himself, who sent and signified it by his angel to his servant John.

Art. II.—DESTRUCTION OF ANTICHRIST BY THE LORD'S COMING.

If the last days of this world's history have been characterized by the brightest display of Divine love ever witnessed, they have been no less characterized by unheard-of exhibitions of human sinfulness. In the incarnate person of the Messiah, the great mystery of godliness had not long been manifested when the great Mystery of iniquity began to work, and to find embodiment in the form of Antichrist. Nor is this a phenomenon to be wondered at, however deeply to be deplored. It is in keeping with the recorded experience of all former times. Every new manifestation of grace that God has given since the world began, has occasioned, on man's part, a new and corresponding manifestation of depravity. The deeper the stream of love that has flowed forth from the bosom of God, the more abundant also has been the issue of corruption from the heart of man. The history of the world, therefore, tells, not only how much God is capable of loving, but likewise how much man is capable of sinning. The heart of man has been revealed as well as the heart of God.

As the Mystery of iniquity began to work soon after the first advent of Messiah, so will it continue to work, and with increasing intensity, till his second advent. In the second chapter of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, it is declared plainly that the destruction of Antichrist shall be effected, not *before*, but *by* the coming of the Lord. "The Mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth, will let, until he be taken out of the way: and then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." (Verses 7, 8.)

Digitized by Google

The man of sin referred to in these words, under the denomination of "*the wicked*," or lawless one, is obviously identical with the Antichrist spoken of in other portions of Scripture. The Antichrist, whether the designation be applied, in general, to apostate Christendom, or, more especially, to an individual as the head of the apostasy, is, at all events, a term pre-eminently descriptive of the character which will be manifested in the last crisis of evil, or just before the commencement of the millennial era. The man of sin, who is to be destroyed by the brightness of the Lord's coming, is necessarily the man of sin who will be in existence when the Lord comes. His character will be the hideous result, the terrific summing up, the perfect evolution of that ungodliness which has been working, with a progressive increase of its strength, in the bosom of past generations. The language employed in the passage above quoted, and elsewhere, in reference to Antichrist, shows plainly that what is meant is no mere abstract system of evil, no mere external organization or institute, framed in subserviency to the interests of ungodliness. Antichrist is an evil spirit, a living energy, that has its place in the hearts, and its manifestation in the doings, of men. Men, breathing the same element of ungodliness, actuated by the same feelings of hatred against the Lord, confederate, or co-operating, in one great Antichristian movement, impersonated and unified in an individual representative or head, are the Antichrist against whom the wrath of God is ere long to be revealed from heaven. The frame-work of the Antichristian system will, doubtless, be shattered and destroyed in that day of vengeance, but the object against which vengeance is specially to be hurled is, the generation of ungodly men. "The Lord shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ."

The reason why the last generation of the ungodly is chiefly referred to in the passage formerly quoted appears to be sufficiently obvious. As all the ungodly men of that generation are regarded, and spoken of, by God as one, because they are all pervaded by one common spirit, and impressed with one common character; so that generation is regarded as identical with all the Antichristian generations that have gone before it. Its identity with these, in point of character and spirit, is not at all affected by its distance or separation from them in point of time. The Antichristian spirit identifies and gives oneness to the men of different

Digitized by Google

countries: in like manner it identifies and gives oneness to the men of different generations. The oneness resulting from congeniality of moral character, is entirely independent on the circumstances of time and locality. The Church of all countries and ages is one Church: in like manner, the Antichrist of all countries and ages is one Antichrist. Therefore, in 2 Thess. ii., God dwells not on the long-drawn line of the apostasy, but fixes on its terminating point—its point of deepest aggravation or intensity: he specially refers to the Antichrist of the last days as being pre-eminent in wickedness, yet morally one with the Antichrist of preceding ages.

But, in this prediction, Antichrist is evidently described as an individual,—as one who has a distinct personal existence. On this point it may be necessary, in passing, to speak a word by way of explanation. Apostate Christendom has in all past generations been represented in the person of an individual; so it will be, doubtless, when the apostate nations are destroyed by the brightness of the Lord's coming. It is almost superfluous to remark, that the head of a party is always identified with the party which he represents. To describe *his* character and destinies is to describe those of his party, and to describe those of his party is to describe his own. The careful reader of Scripture cannot have failed to observe that God speaks in many a prophetic page, now, of a whole people—now, of an individual person, regarded as their leader or representative, in language almost equally applicable to them both; sometimes specially referring to the individual, sometimes to the people, but always in such a manner as shows that they are identified with one another in the thoughts of God. Who has not discovered, for example, that the 109th Psalm has at once special references to the apostate Judas, who betrayed, and general references to the apostate nation, which crucified, the Lord of Glory? As Judas was morally, and in fact, the representative of apostate Israel, so will a personal Antichrist, when the Lord comes, be found acting as the representative of apostate Christendom. He and the ungodly myriads whom he represents being morally one, will be involved in the same sudden and terrible destruction.

Already there have been many Antichrists, and he whom Scripture specially designates the Antichrist,—not in contradistinction to those who have gone before him, but as the last and principal representative of the spirit which they breathed,—is about to emerge from the bottomless pit,—that bottomless pit of anarchy which is being opened by the

Digitized by Google

convulsions of the great revolutionary earthquake that is now in progress. Europe is becoming, so to speak, the mouth of hell. Devilish passions, like the billows of a fiery ocean, are heaving to and fro in the bosom of society. The Mystery of iniquity is hurrying on to its dreadful close, and the son of perdition, the last Antichrist, is at hand. He will resemble the Antichrist of former days, in being, as they have been before him, the offspring and impersonation of the age. He will differ from them only in one respect, but in one that will confer on him a distinctive peculiarity, and a high, though a bad pre-eminence. The Mystery of iniquity, in other words the Antichristian spirit, which in their persons was exhibited under a form of ungodliness, not yet ripe and perfect, will, in his person, have the gigantic stature—the full development of Satanic pride and enmity, which it is destined to attain. He will be distinguished from his Papal predecessors, as the evolution of ripe, athletic manhood is distinguished from the immaturity of youth. Whether or not he will, like them, derive his name from the Papacy, he will be pre-eminent above them all in antagonism or opposition to the truth of God.

Popery, as a system of priestly imposture and popular superstition, is exhibiting manifest symptoms of decrepitude and exhaustion; but we were grievously deceived did we imagine that the spirit of ungodliness, which all along gave to Popery its being, life, and power, is evaporated and gone. It is working this day with greater energy than ever; only, in accommodation to altered circumstances, it is taking a different direction and a different form. It long acted in connexion with general ignorance and the reign of feudalism,—hence its appearance under the form of grovelling servility and superstition. It acts now in connexion with general enlightenment and intellectual pride,—hence the appearance which it is making among the masses of Europe under the form of Infidelity, or Pantheism. The life and spirit of Paganism aforetime were transfused, through a change of outward circumstances, into the form of Popery. The life and spirit of Popery are, through a similar change of outward circumstances, transfusing themselves into another form, more suited to the genius of the age. The genius of the age will retain, perhaps, the institutions and the hierarchy of Rome; these are too well adapted to be the organs of Infidelity or Pantheism to be despised. But the existence of Jehovah will be denied, yea, it is already denied by millions. Man is now deified and worshipped. The people

Digitized by Google

are now hailed as sovereign, irresponsible, and omnipotent; their will is law; their voice, according to the characteristic blasphemy of the day, is the voice of God. Jesus is, by millions, no longer recognised as the Christ; Christ's advent in the flesh is openly and positively denied; the Christ of philosophers is nothing else than man, rising, through means of incessant change, towards the ideal of generic perfection; the Christ of politicians is the people elevated to the possession of power; their Gospel is the proclamation of the people's rights, and their Christianity is the people's deliverance from political control. Millions have already believed the lie. Let a man only arise, whether in the line of the Papal or the imperial succession, capable of impersonating the spirit of the age, and he will be hailed—worshipped as God and Christ. The last Antichrist, thus ushered into political being, will draw upon himself the wonder of them that dwell on the earth, and whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world. In his person, more fully than in the persons of his predecessors, will the prediction be realised, "He opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God."

But, whatever views be entertained regarding the character of the last Antichrist, it is certain that, when the Lord comes, all who breathe the spirit of Antichrist will be involved in one common ruin. Another point, in regard to which there cannot be any difference of opinion, is, that Antichrist's destruction must be at, or immediately before, the beginning of the Millennium. What we now seek to establish, on the firm ground of Scripture testimony, is the fact, that the destruction of Antichrist is to be accomplished, not by a providential advent, as some hold, but by the personal advent of the Messiah, and, consequently, that the Messiah's personal advent is to take place at the beginning of the Millennium, not at its close. The subject is one of great importance; it deserves the serious and prayerful consideration of every child of God.

We shall endeavour to prove the point in question:

I. By considering particularly the words which occur in 2 Thess. ii. 8.

II. By taking a general view of the passage with which these words are connected; and

III. By the analogy of prophetic Scripture.

I. In the first place, let us consult the words of the proof-

Digitized by Google

text just indicated, "Then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." Do not these words, taken in their natural and obvious signification, strongly favour the presumption that Antichrist is to be destroyed by the second or glorious advent of the Messiah? Would they not convey that impression to one who read them for the first time, and who was, moreover, free from the bias of prejudice? Assuming, for a moment, that it was here the intention of the inspired apostle to indicate Christ's personal advent, we ask if he could have used language more appropriate or precise to express his meaning? Nay, more; when we consider that the style here employed is not that of poetry, which, within certain limits, might admit of bold, figurative expression, but that it is such a plain, subdued, and direct style, as is suited to the purposes of correspondence, we ask, if the use of such language, to designate any other than a personal coming, would not inevitably have the effect of creating misapprehension? Whatever other difficulties may occur from time to time, in fixing the interpretation of Scripture, no *real* difficulty ever arises from ambiguity of language. Whenever a word is not used in its proper and obvious sense, there is always something in the sentence or passage to qualify and ascertain its signification. In the present instance, we find the Lord's coming spoken of in language, which, taken in its natural import, does, at least as emphatically as any other language which could have been employed, denote a personal coming, and, at the same time, *there is not to be found, in the whole passage, a single word, or a single allusion, which might lead us even to suspect that a different kind of coming is meant.*

It were dangerous to tamper with, or pervert by reasoning, the plain and simple statements of the Word of God. It were dangerous to apply to them a method of interpretation, which, in common honesty, we could not apply to the statements of our fellow-men. Let us beware of that natural tendency to Rationalism, which would lead us to substitute the prejudices of theory, or the results of speculation, for the revelations of Holy Writ. In connexion with one recorded instance of lax interpretation, God has shown what importance he attaches to the very words, and the exact forms of expression, which he has seen fit to employ: "Peter, seeing the disciple whom Jesus loved following . . . . saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow

Digitized by Google

thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren that that disciple should not die; yet Jesus said not unto him, *He shall not die;* but, *If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?*" This portion of Scripture is exceedingly precious, as illustrating the necessity of exactly weighing the very words which God has spoken, in order to ascertain the truth.

We repeat that, in the words of the proof-text now under consideration, there is nothing whatever to intimate that these words are to be understood in reference to a merely spiritual, providential, or figurative coming of the Lord. On the other hand, no language is better fitted than that which the apostle has here employed, to convey the idea of a literal, real, or personal coming. A closer examination of the language in question will make this abundantly obvious. The word in the original Greek (*παρουσια*) which is here rendered "coming," is one which has peculiar force. It always denotes, when applied to a thing destitute of life, the *actual presence* or *introduction* of the thing in question; and, when applied to a person, it always denotes the *actual presence* or *coming* of the person,—never a constructive or metaphorical presence or coming, unless there be some other word annexed to it to restrict its meaning. The apostle uses it, for example, in the verse following the proof-text, to indicate the coming of Antichrist: "Whose coming (*παρουσια*) is after the working of Satan." Here it means *the actual coming* of Antichrist, and nothing else. Though Antichrist were only a system, yet such is the force of the word under consideration, that it would denote only such an in-bringing or establishment of the system, as was real,—not one that was merely figurative. It is evident that, when we speak of the coming-in of a system, we attribute to the system, by a very common kind of personification, the power of life and motion, but it is no less evident that it is the system, personified though it be,—the system itself, and not something else, that we speak of as coming in. It is an actual in-bringing of the system, and of nothing else than the system, that is meant. We maintain that the man of sin is not a system, but a living person acting as the representative of apostate Christendom, but whether the man of sin be a living person, or merely the personification of a system, the word *παρουσια* denotes the coming in of the man of sin, and not of something else. It will not be denied that the Lord Jesus Christ is a living person. He is not a system personified. The coming (*παρουσια*) of the Lord Jesus Christ, therefore, means his personal coming, for

Digitized by Google

the word under consideration, as we have already observed, has such force, that when applied to a person it necessarily means his actual coming or presence. In his Epistles to the Thessalonians, Paul uses the word six times to denote the coming of Christ, and *in five instances out of the six*, it is admitted by all, without exception, to be a real or personal coming which it denotes. It is used in 1 Thess. ii. 19: "For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his *coming* (παρουσιᾳ)?" Again, in chap. iii. 13: "To the end he may stablish your hearts unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the *coming* (παρουσιᾳ) of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints." A third time, in chap. iv. 15: "We which are alive and remain unto the *coming* (παρουσιαν) of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep." A fourth time, in chap. v. 23: "I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto the *coming* (παρουσιᾳ) of our Lord Jesus Christ." And again, in 2 Thess. ii. 1: "We beseech you, brethren, by the *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto them." In all these instances, it confessedly and undeniably signifies a real or personal coming of the Lord. The only other instance in which Paul uses it in these Epistles to indicate the Lord's advent, is that which occurs in the verse before us, and why should we put on it, in this one solitary instance, a peculiar and altogether different signification? What is there in this verse to restrict or modify it, so as to make it denote a figurative, and not, as in every other instance, a literal advent? *Absolutely nothing*. The necessities of system may here require it to bear a metaphorical import, but the analogies of Scripture usage, and the accuracies of scholarship, which ever bear a friendly aspect towards truth, demand that here, as elsewhere, it be taken in its obvious and literal acceptation. Antichrist will be destroyed by the brightness of the Lord's personal coming.

The proof of this momentous fact accumulates as we proceed in our examination. The Greek word (ἐπιφανεια), which is here translated "brightness," is used elsewhere in the New Testament five several times, and always by the same apostle. It is a remarkable fact, that in all the five instances referred to, it is applied confessedly to either the first or the second advent. In all of them, it is rendered in our English version by the word "appearing." It occurs in 1 Tim. vi. 14: "Keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the *appearing* (ἐπιφανειας) of our Lord Jesus

Digitized by Google

Christ." In 2 Tim. i. 10: "Grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus, before the world began, but is now made manifest by the *appearing* (ἐπιφανειας) of our Saviour Jesus Christ. In chap. iv. 1: "I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead, at his *appearing* (ἐπιφανειαν) and his kingdom." Again, in the eighth verse: "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day, and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his *appearing* (ἐπιφανειαν)." The remaining instance occurs in the Epistle to Titus ii. 13: "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious *appearing* (ἐπιφανειαν) of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." We see, then, that in no other part of the New Testament is the word in question employed to denote anything else than the personal appearing or manifestation of the Messiah, and the assumption that it has a different meaning in the text before us, is entirely groundless. Either the one or the other of the two words which we have considered, would singly, and by itself, have sufficed to indicate a literal advent, but here they are both used, as if to accumulate proof upon us, that nothing but a real and literal advent is signified. The words might be translated as follows: "Then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy by the *appearing* of his presence."

The doctrine which it is our object to establish, is so momentous in relation to the present prospects, and the eternal destinies of all, that, at the risk of creating in our readers a feeling of irksomeness, we have entered into such minutiæ of interpretation. We shall only add farther, in connexion with this branch of the subject, that the words before us, denoting the coming of the Lord, are, in the original, by means of a restrictive article, the force of which cannot always be easily conveyed in our language, *referred definitely to a certain coming which has been previously either spoken of or understood.* "The brightness of his coming already referred to,"—that is the force of the expression in the original language, as affected by the article in question. Now, what is the coming previously understood, or spoken of by the apostle, and so present to the mind of the Thessalonian Church, as the object of its expectations? In the foregoing part of this, as well as frequently in the former, epistle, there is direct and particular mention made of the Lord's personal advent in glory,—whereas, neither in the former Epistle, nor

Digitized by Google

in the preceding part of this one, is there a single word that would lead to the expectation, or even suggest the idea, of any other kind of coming whatever. It is, therefore, the Lord's personal advent in glory to which the words under consideration do, by the reference involved in their very structure, carry back our thoughts, and we are thus necessarily shut up to the conclusion, that they denote the personal advent of our Lord in glory, and nothing else.

II. In the second place, we proceed to show, that a general view of the passage to which our proof-text belongs, carries us directly to the same conclusion.

To expound with accuracy the several parts of a paragraph, or closely-connected passage, we must necessarily attend to three things: We must ascertain, First, What is the subject of the passage; Secondly, What is the object which the writer has in view; and, Thirdly, we must see that the several parts of the passage be interpreted in proper keeping or congruity with the whole.

What, then, is the general subject of the passage before us, namely, of that portion of the chapter which concludes with the eighth verse? A glance at the passage is enough to satisfy us that the apostle's subject is the Lord's second advent. Of that advent he has been speaking in the preceding chapter, and he continues, though for a different purpose, to speak of it in this: "Now, we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand." The subject here proposed is, the day of Christ, that is, the day of his advent in glory. On this point there neither is, nor can be, any difference of opinion. So much for the subject in hand. As for the object of the apostle, it is likewise so evident, that it would be difficult to misapprehend it. The Thessalonians had been led by the preaching and correspondence of the apostle to look for "that blessed hope, even the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." It appears that an enemy, aware of the expectations which they cherished, had endeavoured to alarm and trouble their minds, by insinuating, in a forged epistle, transmitted under Paul's name and signature, that the day of Christ was not "*at hand*," according to our version, but, to give correctly the sense of the original expression, was *present*, or *actually come*. As, amidst the up-springing of diverse errors, it was soon taught at Corinth that the resurrection was past already, so,

Digitized by Google

at Thessalonica, it had been taught or insinuated that the coming of the Lord had already taken place. The Thessalonians had expected that the coming of the Lord would be visible to all, and that they would be caught up to meet the Lord in the clouds of heaven; they were therefore confounded or stunned, and thrown into a state of painful excitement, by the lying insinuation. If the Lord were already come, how wofully had they been disappointed! His coming must have been of a very different nature from what they had all along been expecting. It was necessary to relieve them from their panic-excitement, and to recal them to correct views in reference to the subject of the Lord's advent. The apostle writes to them accordingly on the subject, and his special object in doing so, is to show that, so far from having already come, the day of Christ would not arrive till certain events, which he specifies, had occurred. These events are the falling away or apostasy of the Church, and the revelation of the man of sin,—events of which the apostle had, on a previous occasion, spoken to the Thessalonian converts: "Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he should be revealed in his time? For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth, will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming."

As it was here the apostle's object to indicate the great leading events which were to transpire previously to the Lord's appearing, it may be just observed, in passing, that if a long period, a whole millennium of blessing and prosperity, had to elapse ere the Lord's appearing, a fact so vastly important, so deeply interesting, would not, we may well suppose, have been passed over in silence. We may well suppose that a prominent place would have been here assigned to it among the events which were destined to intervene. Nothing, however, is mentioned, or even alluded to, except the apostasy, and the revelation of Antichrist. There is not the faintest shadow of an intimation, that a millennium of unexampled righteousness and peace was to roll past its

Digitized by Google

blessed centuries ere Christ should appear in glory. The entire absence of such an intimation can be accounted for only on the ground, that no such millennium at all was to be interposed. We do not mean, however, to press this point,—we state it merely in passing; and the argument which we seek specially at present to submit to the candid consideration of our readers rests on entirely different and independent ground.

The argument referred to lies simply in the fact, that, unless the coming, by the brightness of which the man of sin is to be destroyed, be regarded as a real or personal coming, the conditions of a relevant or congruous interpretation, imposed by the connexion subsisting between the verse in which that coming is spoken of and the context, are completely violated. This fact seems to be as clear as noonday. In the passage under review, the subject of the apostle, as we have seen already, is the Lord's second coming,—and his object, as we have likewise seen already, is to show, that previously to that coming there will be an apostasy of the Church, and a revelation of the Antichrist. No sooner has he foretold these events, as necessarily intermediate (and therefore, as signs that the day of the Lord is drawing nigh), than he proceeds, in the eighth verse, to declare, that Antichrist, being at length revealed, the Lord will destroy him by the brightness of his coming. The apostle, in this passage, begins to speak of the Lord's literal coming,—no one denies that: he goes on to say, that, previously to the Lord's literal coming, certain specified events will occur,—this no one denies: and he concludes by telling us (ver. 8), that after the occurrence of the events specified, the Lord will come. Now, making appeal to the candour and common sense of our readers, we affirm that, in order to interpret the coming last spoken of, and by which Antichrist is to be destroyed, at all in keeping or harmony with the general subject and scope of the passage, we must interpret it as the very same coming with that mentioned and dwelt upon in the preceding context: in other words, we must admit that it is the literal coming of the Lord. If this be denied,—if it be maintained that the coming referred to in the eighth verse is not the same coming at all with that which immediately before has been the subject on hand, then the irrelevance of the eighth verse, its incongruity with what goes before it, were too palpable to be concealed by any refinements or dexterities of criticism. But no charge of incongruity or irrelevance lies, or can lie, against the sacred text: the charge lies only

Digitized by Google

against an interpretation of it which unwarrantably assumes or takes for granted, that in the same passage, and in exactly the same words, the apostle speaks of two entirely different comings, without giving the slightest hint that the comings spoken of are different. It is a rule which approves itself to right reason and common sense, that if one interpretation of a text be in harmony with the general scope and subject of the whole passage, while another interpretation is entirely destitute of that merit, the former ought by all means to be preferred. Let us admit that the eighth verse relates to a literal coming,—the interpretation of it will then harmonize perfectly with what goes before. Let us, on the contrary, assume that the coming spoken of in the eighth verse is not literal, but figurative, and our interpretation will labour under the charge of a manifest incongruity. Does the apostle show in this passage that the literal coming of Christ will necessarily be subsequent to certain occurrences? Then, what can be more reasonable, or more in keeping with the tenor of the passage, than to maintain that, when he mentions, as he does in the eighth verse, the coming of Christ as subsequent to the occurrences referred to, he means the same literal coming as before?

The fact, that he has just been speaking of a literal coming, is a strong presumptive proof that it is the same, and not a different coming, which he speaks of in the verse before us. This strong presumption becomes a moral certainty, when we find, that neither in this verse nor in those immediately preceding it does he throw out the slightest hint, that the coming mentioned in it is not the same, but one of a very different kind and nature from that which has just before been the subject of discourse. The argument will amount to a demonstration, if only the apostle, so far from hinting any change of subject, give, in the form of expression which he uses, plain and unequivocal intimation that the subject is not changed;—in other words, that the advent foretold in this verse is the very same with that previously under consideration. Such a plain and unequivocal intimation is actually given; for, as we formerly mentioned, the original words used in this verse to describe Christ's coming, have prefixed to them an article, which defines or limits their application, so as to identify the coming which they describe with that spoken of in the preceding context. Such is the form of expression employed, that it sends us back upon the context to ascertain the nature of the advent referred to.

Digitized by Google

Whether we take, then, a general view of the whole passage, or confine ourselves to a critical examination of the language in which the prediction of the eighth verse is couched, we find no ground whatever for the assumption, that Antichrist is to be destroyed by the brightness of a coming, providential or figurative, such as is nowhere previously alluded to in the whole epistle: on the contrary, we are shut up, on all sides, to the conclusion, that the verse in question connects the destruction of Antichrist with the brightness of that literal or personal coming which, in the preceding part of the epistle, has been mentioned again and again. The proof afforded by this passage in favour of the pre-millennial advent of Messiah, is, in one view, so strong and decisive, that, although we labour under no such necessity, we could, nevertheless, venture securely on it all the weighty issues and momentous interests of the controversy. So long as this passage remains an acknowledged portion of inspired truth, it will stand on the side of pre-millennialism immovable and unshaken, like a rock amidst the waves of controversy, shivering as into foam and spray every hostile argument. If ever a tone of dogmatism be justifiable in vindicating the plain doctrines of inspiration, surely a revelation so clear and explicit as the one before us, throwing, as it does, around our cause an argument of bulwark massiveness and impregnable strength, will fully justify us if, with a tone of unfaltering confidence, we maintain, that Antichrist is to be destroyed by the literal, personal, pre-millennial coming of the Messiah. Yet a little while, and the Lord will destroy that wicked one by appearing in the glory of his adorable person, as the incarnate Son of God.

III. In the third place, we have to show that the view given above is supported and confirmed by the analogy of prophetic Scripture. Many other passages, besides that which we have been considering, predict, either directly or implicitly, that the downfall of Antichrist is to take place at the time of the Lord's personal appearing. Let us glance at a few of these; and in doing so, let us, in every instance, determine whether the coming spoken of be literal or figurative, by bringing to bear upon it the light of the context, or that of explanatory quotations made from it in other parts of Scripture.

1. In Isaiah xxvi. 21, and xxvii. 1, the Lord's coming is connected, as follows, with the overthrow of Antichrist:—"Behold, the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity: the earth also

Digitized by Google

shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain. In that day, the Lord with his sore and great and strong sword shall punish Leviathan the piercing serpent, even Leviathan that crooked serpent; and he shall slay the dragon that is in the sea." The language used in the first of these verses is strikingly similar to that elsewhere employed in Scripture regarding Christ's personal advent. "*Behold, the Lord cometh* out of his place;"—these words naturally recal to memory the graphic description of the advent given in the Apocalypse: "*Behold, he cometh* with clouds, and every eye shall see him." Again: "The Lord cometh out of his place *to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity.*" These words, by a kind of elective attraction, associate themselves in our minds with "*the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men,*" which, in his Second Epistle, Peter foretels as the day of the Messiah's advent; and still more readily do they suggest the following well-known prophecy:—"The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, *in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.*" These coincidences favour the impression naturally made by the language of Isaiah, that it is the literal advent which he has in view; and, if we go back upon the context of the prophecy itself for additional light, we shall find ample proof that the impression is not erroneous. There (chap. xxvi. ver. 19), we are informed that one of the events which are to occur on the day when the Lord shall "come out of his place" for the destruction of Antichrist is, the resurrection of Christ's mystical body, the Church. "Thy dead men shall live, my dead body, they shall arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." The fact, that on that prophetic day the resurrection of the saints is to take place, makes it a matter of certainty that the prophet speaks, not of a figurative, but of the second literal coming of the Lord. But the argument must not rest here. It may be denied, though we see nothing that will justify the denial, that the resurrection described in the words above quoted is a literal resurrection; and therefore we fall back for confirmation of our argument on the testimony of the preceding chapter. In that chapter, which obviously refers to the occurrences of the same prophetic day, the literal resurrection of the saints is specially predicted as one of these occurrences. The prediction is thus given in the eighth verse: "He will swallow up death in victory." That this,

Digitized by Google

at all events, is a prediction of the literal resurrection of Christ's people cannot be denied without applying rationalistic principles to set aside the authority of inspiration; for, in 1 Cor. xv. 54, it is expressly interpreted by the Spirit himself as a prediction of the literal resurrection: "When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, 'Death is swallowed up in victory.'" Fortified by the authority of God's own interpretation of his own prophecy, we hold it as a doctrine of Scripture, to be received by us all with the simplicity of a child-like spirit, that it is a literal resurrection of the Church which Isaiah predicts as contemporaneous, or nearly so, with the destruction of Antichrist; and, consequently, that it is a literal coming of the Lord, whereby, according to the terms of the prediction, the destruction of Antichrist is to be effected.

2. The seventh chapter of Daniel contains a prophecy which strongly confirms the same doctrine. After giving a description of the Roman empire (last in order of the four prophetic Gentile monarchies), and of the appearance of Antichrist within its bounds, the prophet at the ninth verse proceeds as follows:—"I beheld, till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened. I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame. As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away: yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time. I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." The Ancient of days is here represented as placing his throne on the earth, for the purpose of bringing at length to a decisive issue the long-pending suit of the Messiah against the rebellious nations.

Digitized by Google

He judges Antichrist, and gives him over to destruction; thus making preparation for the establishment of Christ's universal dominion in the earth. He then gives Christ formal and solemn investiture with the sovereignty which he claims as the Anointed Redeemer, and, therefore, the rightful Lord of redeemed creation. This procedure is in fulfilment of predictions or promises, such as those given in the second and the hundred-and-tenth Psalms: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies." As, in human nature, Christ sat down, after his resurrection, at the right hand of God, so, in human nature, he will come to Zion, and there wield the rod of his strength in the midst of his enemies. Like the nobleman of the parable, he has, in human nature, gone to a far country to receive a kingdom, and then to return. Having received the kingdom, he will return, in human nature, to exercise the prerogatives of royalty. This is plainly predicted in the prophecy before us: "I saw in the night visions, and behold, One, like the Son of man, came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him." Here Christ is seen coming in his human nature. The advent described is not figurative, but literal; it is the advent of *the Son of man.* This interpretation rests on Scripture authority. Repeatedly are the words of Daniel introduced in New Testament prophecies of the Second Advent. It is written in Matthew: "*They shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven,* with power and great glory;" in Mark: "*Ye shall see the Son of man* sitting on the right hand of power, and *coming in the clouds of heaven;*" and in the Apocalypse: "*Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him.*" These quotations—for they can scarcely be regarded as anything else than quotations from Daniel's prophecy—are like so many voices from the Word of God, testifying that it is the Second Advent of Christ to which that prophecy refers.

The prophecy is indeed couched in language that is partly symbolical, but likewise in language that is partly direct. If part of it were not conveyed in direct language, the symbolic terms would be utterly unintelligible. It were an

Digitized by Google

overstrained, exaggerated, and impious interpretation, which should assume that "the Ancient of days" is a symbolic expression, not in reality denoting Jehovah, but something else, or that "the Son of man" is not in reality the Son of man, but only a symbolic form of speech. The Ancient of days does literally, at the time referred to, exercise special judgment among the nations; countless myriads of attendant spirits do literally wait then before him to execute his behests; the Son of man does literally come in the clouds of heaven,—he is literally installed by the Ancient of days in the government of the earth. A due appreciation of what is evidently symbolical on the one hand, and of what is evidently direct on the other, will, we are persuaded, bring us to these conclusions. Is it not manifest that the words of the fourteenth verse,—"There was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away; and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Are not these words manifestly to have a literal fulfilment? What reason, then, can be assigned for affirming that the preceding verse *must* indicate, not a literal, but merely a symbolic action?—that it *must* predict, not an actual, but merely a figurative advent of the Son of man? Is there not good ground, on the contrary, for affirming that the advent here described is of a literal or personal character? and, therefore, that this prophecy, in common with those formerly examined, connects the second coming of the Messiah with the overthrow of Antichrist?

3. If we pass on to the end of the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth chapter of Daniel, we shall find additional evidence in favour of the same view. After detailing the movements and exploits of Antichrist, the prophet thus announces his destruction: "He shall plant the tabernacle of his palaces between the seas, in the glorious holy mountain; yet shall he come to his end, and none shall help him." Then events are predicted which are to occur about the same time. One of these events is, the resurrection of the saints: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." But the resurrection of the saints will not take place till the second coming of the Lord; therefore his second coming is, by this prophecy also, fixed down to the time of the destruction of Antichrist.

4. Many passages, which equally favour the doctrine of Christ's premillennial advent, must necessarily be omitted;

Digitized by Google

but ere concluding, we shall notice one remarkable prophecy of New Testament Scripture. In the Gospel of Matthew, chap. xxiv., the Lord foretels a period of unexampled tribulation or distress: "Then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be." The report of our Lord's words, given by the Evangelist Luke, chap. xxi., vers. 23, 24, explains the character of the tribulation referred to: "There shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." From this more full and explicit statement, it is obvious that the tribulation-period spoken of by our Lord, will not reach its close till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled, and, consequently, till about the time when Antichrist shall perish. But the expiry of that tribulation-period is to be followed immediately by the Lord's second coming. No interval of a thousand years is destined to elapse beforehand: "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven, and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory." Calvin, perhaps of all Commentators the most sagacious and profound, interprets these words as decidedly predictive of the Lord's personal advent; and no other interpretation can be vindicated, except on principles which, if applied with thorough-going consistency to every other portion of prophetic Writ, would cause all that is divine to evaporate, and leave nothing but a residuum of mere human speculation. We have established the fact, then, on the ground of yet another independent prophecy,—that it is the personal coming of Messiah by which Antichrist and the confederate nations of apostate Christendom shall be overwhelmed with ruin.

To show the certainty of that fact,—a fact as certain, though it be as yet only prophetic, as it will be when it has received an historic accomplishment,—we have now examined minutely the plain prediction of it contained in 2 Thess. ii. 8; we have viewed that prediction in the clear strong light derived from an examination of the whole connected

Digitized by Google

passage: and that a fact, involving issues so vastly momentous, may not seem to rest merely on the ground of an insulated prediction, however decisive, we have, for the purpose of giving it the advantage of additional and independent evidence, appealed, in conclusion, to the analogy of prophetic Scripture. Take what ground we will within the domain of prophecy, we feel that ground, so to speak, trembling under the chariot-wheels of a coming Saviour. To whatever page we turn for information, a voice comes forth in testimony to the fact of a literal premillennial advent. Let us sweep round the circumference of the wide prophetic circle, and seek the centre of it from whatever point we will, from that point we are led down still into the expectation that Antichrist shall be overthrown, and a millennial reign of righteousness be introduced by the personal coming of the Son of man. Around that coming, as its central truth, the whole circle of prophecy revolves: around that coming, therefore, as their central hope, should revolve the thoughts of God's ransomed and expectant people.

The Church has waited long; but her waiting is not in vain. Yet a little while, and her hope shall be realized,—her Lord will come to deliver her from all her enemies. Her dark night is drawing to a close, and the dawn of her glorious day is at hand. Thrones are tottering insecurely amidst the convulsions of these perilous times; the nations are weltering in the tide of a great revolutionary movement; the sea and the waves are roaring; the foundations of social order are destroyed. But the Church has no cause to be alarmed. On the skirts of the dark cloud which is hanging, pregnant with disaster and ruin, over the ungodly nations, she may discern the streaks of dawn. Amidst the thunders which are rolling in the political firmament, she may hear, nearer and still nearer, the footsteps of her Anointed King. Tossed in her frail bark upon the billows of this stormy sea, she may see the form of one walking upon the waters, and hear his "still small voice," saying, "It is I; be not afraid." If she know what is the hope of her calling, she will look up amidst the growing troubles of the day,—she will lift up her head, for her redemption is drawing nigh. These growing troubles are the predicted signs of approaching deliverance. "When the wicked spring as the grass, and when all the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they may be destroyed for ever. But thou, Lord, art Most High for evermore. For, lo! thine enemies, O Lord!

Digitized by Google

for, lo! thine enemies shall perish: all the workers of iniquity shall be scattered. But my horn shalt thou exalt like the horn of an unicorn: I shall be anointed with fresh oil."

The day and the hour of the Lord's advent are concealed,—they will never be known till the trumpet sound, and the voice of the archangel ring through the vault of heaven. But such are the signs of the times, and such the intimations of the sure word of prophecy, as to create the hope that another generation shall not pass away ere the Lord come to reign in glory with his saints. Now, if ever,—we speak to all who may read these pages,—now, if ever, we must watch and pray, "that we may be counted worthy to escape the things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man." We may not taste of death till the world be wrapt in flames, and Antichrist, with his apostate myriads, be cast into the lake of fire. "What manner of persons ought we then to be, in all holy conversation and godliness!" Oh! let no one who is living without an interest in the blood of Christ, and setting his affections on the things of this sin-stained, wrath-devoted world, think that *he* shall escape on that day of vengeance. He is on the side of Antichrist, and with Antichrist he shall perish. None but those who have "the blood of the passover" on their doorposts, and "the seal of the living God on their foreheads," shall be able to stand. On that day, none will receive "the crown of righteousness" but those (be they or be they not pre-millenarians like ourselves) "who love the Lord's appearing." The Lord will be glorified only "in his saints," and admired only "in those who believe." All besides, within the pale of the visible Church, to whatever section of the visible Church they may belong,—all who "know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," shall be punished on that day "with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." To the children of disobedience the beginning of the millennium will be the beginning of an undone eternity. The doctrine of Christ's premillennial advent may be misunderstood, or perverted, by such amongst its friends as are carnal and profane; but, in truth, if it be a blessed doctrine, as it is, and one full of glorious hope, it is so only to the children of God. Against those who despise or neglect the great salvation, it breathes nothing but threatenings of fast-coming indignation and wrath. *They* are identified with

Digitized by Google

Antichrist; they breathe his spirit; they fight under his banner; they are enrolled among his hosts as adversaries of the Lord; therefore they shall be partakers of his doom,—they shall be consumed by the Lord "with the Spirit of his mouth," and "be destroyed with the brightness of his coming."

Art. III.—PROPHECIES OF BALAAM.*

It has been conjectured that Balaam was indebted for his knowledge of God to traditional remains of truth first brought into Mesopotamia by Jacob when he went there to sojourn. By whatever means he came by it, it never did more than illuminate his understanding. Conscience and heart were both strangers to its power. He held it "in unrighteousness." (Rom. i. 18.) Practical heathenism, and an acquaintance with the patriarchal faith, appear to have been strangely blended in this remarkable man. He was sent for by the King of Moab as a soothsayer (Josh. xiii. 22), of great reputation, whose blessing and whose curse were alike accounted effectual. (xxii. 6.)

It seems, too, that Balaam was accustomed to hold some sort of intercourse with God; for, on the very first arrival of Balak's messengers, he tells them to wait until the Lord should speak with him (ver. 8); and he talks of "the Lord *my* God." (Ver. 18.)

An exclusively intellectual familiarity with truth; intense covetousness; the being used as a channel of blessing to others which he himself never tasted; the supernatural endowment which clothed a corrupt nature; marvellous privileges unsanctified and unimproved, and which he would fain have turned to the account of his ruling passion,—find a ready parallel in another awful character, and make Balaam, as it were, the Judas of the Old Testament.

Obtaining, at length, the Divine permission to go with the men if they came to call him (ver. 20), Balaam's eagerness would not suffer him to wait for their call, and hastening on his way to obtain the wages of unrighteousness, he was arrested by the angel, and was rebuked for his iniquity; the dumb ass, speaking with man's voice, forbad the madness of the prophet. (2 Pet. ii. 16.)

The perverse will and stubborn pride of man scarcely ever

* Numbers xxii.—xxiv.

Digitized by Google

received a more humiliating rebuke than on this occasion. How ready to the hand of God are the means for correcting his creature's sin! A gourd instructs the petulant Jonah; thirst tames the boasting spirit of Sampson, but the man whose eyes were open, and who saw the vision of the Almighty, not only was not allowed, at this time, to see what was visible to the beast that carried him, but also received from the ill-used animal herself a reproof for his unreasonable anger and blind obstinacy.*

This evil man is the prototype of a class which soon began to manifest itself even among professing Christians. Peter, in the context from which the above passage is taken, calls them "children of the curse," that is, accursed persons (compare Eph. ii. 2), "which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam, the son of Bosor," &c.; and Jude, describing the same class, says, "Woe unto them; for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core." In this verse the change of tense from the present (vers. 10, 12) to the aorist, seems to be for the purpose of giving an epitome of the history of these characters in a general way,† and of tracing their course to its termination, not so much with reference to any particular or individual instances, as to the general doom which, hanging over each successive generation, will be really visited on the one which shall exist at the second advent.‡ The class which sets out in the self-chosen, wilful way of Cain, rejecting grace, and standing in its own self-righteousness, greedily runs after the error of Balaam with an increased impetus to its sin, ministered by the love of gain; and finally is found in the ranks of open apostates, braving God, like Corah,

* Cruelty to animals is one of the many evil features in the character of fallen man. How unworthy of a being on whose account the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now, to spread and augment, instead of alleviating miseries and suffering which, but for him, no creature would have known! Such, too, as find a pleasure in barbarous and wanton sports would do well to remember that a divine covenant of mercy embraces not only man, but *every living creature*. (Gen. ix. 12, 15—17.) Every beast of the earth is interested in the "bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain;" and many other notices of the Divine considerateness towards animals are contained in Scripture. See Deut. xxii. 6, 7; xxv. 4; Jonah iv. 11.

† In James i. 11, is a similar instance of this kind of aorist, which our common version has there rendered by the present tense.

‡ The same principle enters into the parable of the tares, and is elsewhere very common. See 1 Thess. iv. 17: "We which are alive and remain," &c.

Digitized by Google

and perishes as part of the Antichristian faction of the last days.

The dark shades of evil which, though by no means unknown in apostolic times, will spread their thickest gloom over the closing period of the dispensation, are sketched in very similar language by both Peter and Jude. And it is but too easy to recognise the ways of Cain and Balaam in the paths trodden by multitudes in the present day. How common it is become to "despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities!" How prevalent is the spirit of grasping covetousness! At what previous time did men's speeches and writings contain so many "great swelling words of vanity?" When were there so many beguiling unstable souls, "promising liberty, themselves the slaves of corruption?" In fine, what a huge host we have of "dreamers," "murmurers," "complainers," "sensualists," and "mockers," walking "after their own ungodly lusts."

It was with reference to a class which should exhibit the combined evil, and group together the hateful features of three of the worst men that ever lived, to an age which should witness that class swelled in number to an unprecedented amount, that Enoch delivered his remarkable prophecy. Over-reaching in the vast range of his prophetic vision the ungodly of his own day, and the judgment which was prepared for them (though his words might have had a reference to this also), the seventh from Adam adds his testimony to that of Peter and Jude, and is a preacher of the second advent to the men of the nineteenth century, as well as to the antediluvian world. "The Lord came (ἦλθε) with his holy myriads," &c., is the language of one who seems rather to fill the place of an historian than of a seer; to chronicle the past rather than predict the future; to record a doom more dreadful than Cain's; a latter end more fearful than Balaam's; a catastrophe more terrible than Core's, while he proclaims the judgment to be executed on the generation which reproduces their wickedness, and treads in their steps in the last days.

Wickedness of a very monstrous and daring character,—that which sets God at defiance and blasphemously tramples upon his laws, has never, probably, had a very protracted course at any one period. Divine long-suffering has, indeed, tolerated for a considerable period sin like Cain's and Balaam's, but such as Corah's, as in the instances of Pharaoh, Sennacherib, and Belshazzar, has commonly been followed by swift retribution. Thus, also, the abominations

Digitized by Google

of Popery have covered many centuries, but open Antichristian blasphemy will be limited (as we find from Daniel and the Apocalypse), to the last few years of the dispensation. The wording of Jude 11, suggests the same thing—"*perished* in the gainsaying of Core."

To return to the narrative. When we read that the Lord "opened the mouth of the ass" (ver. 28), we may infer that there is no difficulty in the way of our understanding Isaiah xi. 6—9, and lxv. 25, according to the plain, literal sense of the words. Nothing is impossible with God. That the wild animals should lose their ferocity in the millennium, and return to the food on which they lived before sin and death were known (Gen. i. 30), is what no one can pronounce impossible, nor, considering this miracle, even improbable; that the lion should eat straw like the ox, is less wonderful than that an ass should speak.

About the rest of this chapter, it may suffice here to observe: I. That not only the true servants of God subject themselves to his judgment by sin (1 Cor. xi. 32), but even hypocritical professors are often chastened in this life for special acts of perverseness. (Ver. 32). II. That more is required of transgressors than, like Pharaoh and Balaam, to say without any depth of feeling or exercise of conscience, "I have sinned." "Godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of." (2 Cor. vii. 10; ver. 34.) And, III., That the enemies of the Lord's people, the Balaks and Balaams of every age, are powerless to say or do anything, except so far as the Lord permits them. (Ver. 38).

Chapter XXIII.

The seven altars, &c. indicate that Balaam blended heathen rites with the worship of the true God. The Lord having met him and put a word in his mouth, he returns to Balak and the princes of Moab, who were standing on the high places of Baal, by the altars on which the burnt-offerings were being consumed. And he took up his parable, or prophetic poem, and said,—

7 From Aram hath brought me Balak,
The King of Moab, from the mountains of the east,
"Come, curse me, Jacob,
And come, execrate Israel."
8 How shall I curse, (whom) God hath not cursed?
And how shall I execrate, (whom) Jehovah hath not execrated?

Digitized by Google

9 For, from the top of the rocks I see him,
And from the hills I behold him:
Lo, the people alone shall dwell,
And among the nations it shall not be reckoned.
10 Who can count the dust of Jacob,
And the number of the fourth (part) of Israel?
Let my soul* die the death of the righteous (ones),
And let my latter end be like his.

Every one knows that the people have dwelt alone from that time until now; that it has always maintained its separateness amidst the rise and fall of Gentile empires; but the inspiration of God alone could have enabled Balaam to foresee this. All the original dispositions of God, as regards the Gentiles, were made with future reference to this favoured people.

When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance;
When he separated the sons of Adam,
He set the bounds of the peoples,
According to the number of the children of Israel.
Deut. xxxii. 8.

In assigning their territorial limits to the different nations, and distributing them over the earth, he had expressly in view a portion destined hereafter to contain the multitudes of Israel, with reference to whose ultimate possession of it, the bounds of the other peoples were fixed, as merely a subsidiary part of his divine plan.

" — the number of the fourth part of Israel." With allusion probably to one of the four grand divisions of the encampment. "Let me die," &c. The prophet contemplates Israel as it will be when brought under the new covenant (Jer. xxxi.), when its people will be "all righteous." (Isa. lx. 21.) These words do not so much express Balaam's own feelings, as they do the happy lot of the righteous people whom he beholds in the vision of the future; yet it is very likely that, in common with many other wicked men, he might have desired to die the death of the righteous, while he had no disposition to live their life.

Ver. 13. Balak appears to have conceived from Balaam's words (ver. 9), that there was something in the prospect of the whole camp that hindered the success of his object. He carries the prophet, therefore, to the field of Zophim (or, the field of the watchmen), to the top of Pisgah, another part of the mountain ridge (in which was also Mount Nebo,

* *i. e.*, *Me*, according to a Hebrew idiom.

Digitized by Google

from which Moses viewed the promised land—Deut. xxxiv. 1), whence he could only see the utmost part of the people. He builds the altars, and offers the sacrifices as before; and Balaam goes "to meet . . . . yonder." (Ver. 15.) "*The Lord*" is, of course, to be understood here, as expressed in italics in our common version; although not actually mentioned this time by Balaam, freely as he was accustomed generally to use that holy name which he so dishonoured by his ways.

Having again received a word from the Lord, he takes up his parable, and says,—

18 Rise up, Balak, and hear;
Hearken unto me, thou son of Zippor:
19 God is not a man, that he should lie;
Neither a son of man, that he should repent.
Hath *he* said, and shall he not do (it)?
Or hath he spoken, and shall he not perform it?
20 Behold, to bless I have received (a commandment),
And he hath blessed; and I cannot reverse it.
21 He hath not beheld iniquity* in Jacob,
Neither hath he seen perverseness in Israel:
Jehovah his God (is) with him,
And the shout of a king (is) among them.
22 God brought them out of Egypt;
He hath, as it were, the swiftness of an onyx.†
23 Surely there is no enchantment against Jacob,
Neither any divination against Israel:
At this time it shall be said of Jacob and of Israel,
What hath God wrought?
24 Behold, the people shall rise up as a lioness,
And lift up himself as a lion:
He shall not lie down until he eat of the prey,
And drink the blood of the slain.

Ver. 19. Compare the apostle's words ralative to the same subject,—the Lord's immutable purpose to bless Israel, notwithstanding their sins: "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance," *i.e.*, irrevocable, unchangeable. (Rom. xi. 29.) Ver. 21. With reference to the same time, Jeremiah says: "In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, the iniquity of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none; and the sins of Judah, and they shall not be

* These two words, "iniquity," and "perverseness," occur together also, Job iv. 8.

† Such, according to Bochart, Rosenmüller, Dr. Kitto, and others, is the רְאֵם always rendered "unicorn" in our version.

Digitized by Google

found: for I will pardon them whom I reserve." (l. 20.) Marvellous are the riches of the Lord's grace! So completely will the sins of Israel be buried in oblivion in that day, that God himself declares he hath not seen them. He has no memory for the past offences of his people; no eye for aught but the righteousness with which he will then have clothed them. It is instructive to compare together Psalms cv. and cvi. Both sketch Israel's history; but the former tells only of the Lord's actings, and studiously veils the sins of the nation (see especially vers. 40 and 45); whilst the latter minutely records them. Thus Balaam is made to speak of Israel solely as viewed in the light of God's grace. Surveying the tents of those who had bowed before the golden calf, and tempted the Lord in all the years of their wanderings, who were soon to be joined to the abominations of Baal-peor, and who would transmit the characteristics of a generation uncircumcised in heart and ears to their distant posterity; he proclaims on the summit of Pisgah, alike the Gospel and the glory of another age, when the Deliverer, having turned away ungodliness from Jacob, shall reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously (Isa. xxiv. 23), and the shouts of happy myriads announce that the Lord is there.

It seems very clear that the prophecies of Balaam relate mainly and primarily to the millennial condition of Israel. They may just touch intervening periods of its history, but only as earnests of what is yet to come. Never, as yet, has the nation been regarded by God as actually without iniquity and perverseness. In the acclamations which welcomed Solomon to the throne of his father, and disturbed the feasting of Adonijah and his party (1 Kings i. 39—41); "the shout of a king" was but feeble compared with the Hosannas which will hereafter greet a greater than Solomon, coming in the name of the Lord (Ps. cxviii.) to mount the same throne. (Luke i. 32, 33, &c.) And, "What hath God wrought!" will express the admiring feelings of such as will behold in the last days even greater wonders than those which already crowd the page of Israel's marvellous story.

Comparing, too, ver. 24 with Micah v. 8, it will be evident that it principally relates to yet future victories and triumphs of the Jewish people, whatever partial reference it may have to what is past. Vexed at the failure of his purpose, Balak would have been glad to replace matters on their original ground. "Neither curse them at all," he exclaims, "nor bless them at all." But yet he resolves to make one more

Digitized by Google

trial, and he brings Balaam unto the top of Peor that looketh toward Jeshimon (or, *the desert*). Then, after the offering of the sacrifices as on the previous occasions, Balaam, seeing that it pleased the Lord to bless Israel, went not, as he had done before, "to seek for enchantments," that is, auguries, which he would appear from this (such was the perverseness and folly of his mind) to have watched for, even when he went avowedly to meet the Lord (vers. 3, 15); but set his face toward the wilderness. The full view of the Israelitish camp was once more presented to his gaze; a spectacle, with its associations, calculated to awaken, even in *his* sordid mind, the deepest emotions,—a theme worthy of the magnificent poetry with which he is again constrained, by the Spirit of God, to pronounce the blessing, and celebrate the destiny, of Israel. And he took up his parable, and said:—

3 Balaam, the son of Beor, hath said,
And the man whose eye is unclosed hath said;
4 He hath said, who heard the words of God,
Who saw the vision of the Almighty,
Falling (into a trance), and having his eyes open:
5 How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob!
Thy tabernacles, O Israel!
6 As streams are they spread forth;
As gardens by the river's side;
As lign-aloes (which) Jehovah hath planted;
As cedars beside the waters.
7 Water shall flow from his buckets,
And his seed (shall be) in many waters;
And his king shall be higher than Agag,
And his kingdom shall be exalted.
8 God brought him out of Egypt.
He hath, as it were, the swiftness of an onyx.
He shall devour the nations, his enemies,
And shall gnaw their bones,
And pierce (them) through (with) his arrows.
9 He couched, he lay down as a lion,
And as a lioness; who shall stir him up?
Blessed (is) he that blesseth thee,
And cursed (is) he that curseth thee.

Ver. 4, refers probably to the former occasions on which he went to meet God. (Chap. xxiii.) He appears to have fallen into a trance, in which state his mental vision was enabled to discern future things. This is probably what is meant by "having his eyes (*i.e.*, the eyes of his mind) open." But of what avail is it that the *eyes are open*, if the

Digitized by Google

heart is wrong? Balaam's history is a solemn warning against a high-sounding, hypocritical profession, where spirituality is on the lips only, and the love of money reigns in the heart.

Ver. 6. "As streams," &c. The extended rows of tents are compared to the course of streams pouring themselves over a long tract of country; and to flourishing gardens, extending in lengthened succession along the bank of a river. "Which Jehovah hath planted," *i.e.*, growing in wild luxuriance, not by human culture. (Compare Ps. civ. 16.) Ver. 7. "Water shall flow," &c. This is a figure to denote a numerous posterity. (Compare Isa. xlviii. 1; Ps. lxviii. 26.) "His seed shall be in many waters," *i.e.*, his descendants shall be numerous and flourishing. (Compare Isa. xxxii. 20; Ezek. xvii. 5, 8; xix. 10; xxxi. 7.) "Higher than Agag." This was a name common to the kings of the Amalekites. (1 Sam. xv. 8.) Haman is called the "Agagite" (Esth. iii. 1), which is equivalent to "Amalekite." The comparison here shows that Amalek was a very powerful nation at this time.

Enraged at the frustration of his repeated endeavours to cause Baalam to curse Israel, in place of which he had pronounced on them a triple blessing, the King of Moab dismisses the prophet with a bitter sarcasm, both on him and the Lord who had "kept him back from honour." Balaam, however, as he had even declared from the first, had no choice. Dearly as he loved the wages of unrighteousness, and gladly as he would have beheld, for the consideration of the proffered gold, the myriads of Israel perish under a withering curse, he yet found himself, on each occasion, the reluctant channel of a blessing he was unable to reverse. "O my people," said the Lord by a prophet of later days to ungrateful Israel, "Remember now, what Balak, King of Moab, consulted, and what Balaam, the son of Beor, answered him; (remember what I did for thee) from Shittim unto Gilgal," &c. (Micah vi. 5.) But though Balak has done with Balaam, the Lord has not. From the lips of the man he had brought from the far east to curse his enemies, but who had altogether blessed them three times, the King of Moab is forced to listen to the unwelcome announcement of his people's doom, and the judgment which, by the hand of Israel, should be inflicted upon them in the latter days. And he took up his parable, and said:

15 Balaam, the son of Beor, hath said,
And the man whose eye is unclosed hath said;
16 He hath said, who heard the words of God,

Digitized by Google

And knew the knowledge of the Most High,
(Who) saw the vision of the Almighty,
Falling (into a trance) and having his eyes open:
17 I see* him, but not now;
I behold him, but not nigh:
There is come a star out of Jacob:
And there hath arisen a sceptre out of Israel,
And hath smitten both sides of Moab,
And destroyed all the children of Sheth.
18 And Edom is a possession,
And Seir is a possession for his enemies;
And Israel doeth valiantly.
19 And (one) out of Jacob hath dominion,
And hath destroyed him that remained of the city.

"And he looked on Amalek, and took up his parable, and said,"—

20 The first of the nations (was) Amalek;
But his latter end (shall be) even to destruction.

"And he looked on the Kenite, and took up his parable, and said,"—

21 Strong (is) thy dwelling-place,
And thou puttest thy nest in a rock.
22 Nevertheless, Kain shall be consumed,
How long? Asshur shall lead thee captive.

"And he took up his parable, and said,"—

23 Alas! who shall live
When God disposeth this!
24 And ships (shall come) from the coast of Chittim,
And shall afflict Asshur, and shall afflict Eber,
And he also shall be unto destruction.

Ver. 17. There can be no doubt that this refers to the Messiah, whom the prophet sees through the vista of many ages. It is a deeply interesting prophecy, the traditionary memorial of which may not unlikely have been connected with the revelations made to the Magi, and which led these mysterious strangers from the land of the rising sun (perhaps by the same way which was trodden above fourteen centuries before by Balaam), to adore the Divine child, and to behold in Bethlehem the Star of Jacob and the Sceptre of Israel, the stupendous prodigy of love that—

> "Veiled the Lord of earth and skies
> In an infant's lowly guise."

* As Balaam speaks as though actually in the midst of the scenes he describes, the Hebrew preterites in ver. 17 have been here rendered in the

Digitized by Google

If this prophecy was indeed known to them, the manner in which they were guided by the leading of the star to Jerusalem strikes us as peculiarly appropriate. The smiting of Moab, however, and the conquest of Edom (ver. 18), remain yet unfulfilled, although the victories of Saul and David over these nations might be viewed as typical of Messiah's final triumph over them. Ps. lx.; Isa. xxxiv., and lxiii. 1—6,—all evidently Scriptures which pertain to the latter days, throw considerable light on this prophecy. As to "the children of Sheth," a too venturesome criticism has led some to correct the Hebrew reading in this place (notwithstanding that all the ancient versions likewise support it), from Jer. xlviii. 45. The original text in both places is as follows:—

Num. וּמָחַץ פַּאֲתֵי מוֹאָב וְקַרְקַר כָּל־בְּנֵי שֵׁת׃

Jer. וַתֹּאכַל פְּאַת מוֹאָב וְקָדְקֹד בְּנֵי שָׁאוֹן׃

Rosenmüller did not take שֵׁת as a proper name, but he remarked, that if it were one, it probably indicated some people adjoining the Moabites and Amalekites, whose record has perished. This was very near the truth, though it would have been a more probable inference still, that Sheth was but another name for Moab. This very name, indeed, has since been read amongst the hieroglyphics at Ipsambul, and the people meant by it identified with the Moabites and the Ammonites. Mr. Osburn* says, "The proof of this point amounts to absolute certainty," and he notices the valuable illustration it affords of this passage in Balaam's prophecy. In ver. 19 is predicted the utter destruction of the remnant of the Edomites by Him who was to spring from Jacob. Edom, Moab, and Ammon, as we find from Dan. xi. 41, will escape out of the hand of Antichrist, the great blaspheming King (ver. 36), of the last days; but after his destruction their overthrow will also be effected; but the doom of Edom seems to be by far the most terrible of the three. "My sword hath been made drunk (רִוְּתָה) in heaven "(alluding, perhaps, to the preceding verse. See also chap. xxiv. 5.) "Behold, it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse to judgment." (Isa. xxxiv. 5.) Ver. 20. Amalek is probably called "the first of the nations"

past tense. It makes, however, no essential difference whether they are rendered by the past or the future.

* "Ancient Egypt: her Testimony to the Truth," &c. By W. Osburn, jun. Bagster and Sons. London: p. 136.

Digitized by Google

as the most ancient of the Canaanitish tribes. (See Gen. xiv. 7.) Notwithstanding the successive blows inflicted on this people by Saul and David, and the destruction of their remnant in the days of Hezekiah (1 Chron. iv. 43), the last historical mention of them, it may be questioned whether the remembrance of Amalek is yet utterly put out from under heaven. (Exod. xvi. 14.) A small number might have escaped the destruction of their nation, and Haman was probably a descendant of the royal line. If Ps. lxxxiii. relates, as some have thought (and with reason), to a future time, the enumeration of Amalek, in ver. 7, would be decisive proof of the hereafter re-appearance of this doomed race, with its ancient hatred to Israel, and of its final destruction in a general confederacy of the neighbouring nations against the people of God. If, however, this Psalm be supposed to refer exclusively to 2 Chron. xx., the presumption would be, that Amalek has long ago finally disappeared from the earth, and that the "latter end" of the first of the nations has already been "even to destruction."

Verses 21, 22. The Kenites are mentioned among the other Canaanitish tribes Gen. xv. 19. In Saul's time they dwelt among the Amalekites. (1 Sam. xv. 6.) Of the time when the power of Assyria prevailed over the mountain fastnesses of the Kenites we have no record, though, from the following verse, it would seem as if this were a yet unfulfilled prophecy. "Alas! who shall live when God disposeth this!" appears an exclamation very natural from one whose eye is contemplating the terrible scenes at the close of the times of the Gentiles. "Væ peccatoribus qui vivent cum fecit Deus ista," is the not bad paraphrase of Onkelos on this verse. We may regard "the Assyrian" of Balaam's prophecy as the same power which is spoken of by Isaiah (x. 5—end); the scourge of the Lord for the wicked peoples of the last days, both the fruit of whose stout heart, and the glory of whose high looks, will be punished when the Lord hath performed *his whole work upon Mount Zion and on Jerusalem.*

Ver. 24. Dr. Kitto* remarks on this verse, "The remaining of this remarkable prophecy seems very clear, and was accomplished in all its details. It appears to mean generally, that Moab, Edom, and Amalek, should be smitten by the Israelites; who should, in their turn, be overcome and taken captive (with the Kenites), by the Assyrians, who should themselves, ultimately, 'be afflicted' by the Greeks and

* Pictorial Bible.

Digitized by Google

Romans; and that, in the fulness of time, they also should utterly perish." Yet, although the verse may have such an application to what is past, some will, probably, be of opinion, considering the general tenour of Balaam's prophecies, that these words have a yet further reference. It would be interesting (more especially to those who, with the writer of these remarks, entertain the belief that the eleventh of Daniel, from ver. 5 to the end, is still an unfulfilled prophecy) if there were sufficient evidence to show that Dan. xi. 30 related to the same events here spoken of. "Eber" must certainly mean the Hebrews, although the kindred nations descended from Abraham may possibly be included. "He also,"—*i. e.*, the power which sends the ships;—*Italy*, according to the Vulgate;—*Cyprus*, according to others; but Chittim has been understood, with probability, as a general designation for the islands and coasts of the Mediterranean. What particular part is here meant is uncertain.

The enmity of Balak, and the enchantments of Balaam, were of no avail against Israel. Unconscious, at the time, of the deeply interesting things that were being transacted on the mountains within sight of their camp, they knew not of the curse which it had been sought to bring upon them, until they learned at the same time the blessing into which their God had turned it. But the evil council of Balaam, who "taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication," (Rev. ii. 14; Num. xxxi. 16,) was the cause of the destruction of many who, when they had nothing to fear from his curse, fell before the seductive influences he but too successfully used to ensnare them. The coveted wages of unrighteousness, perhaps, for a short season rewarded the author of Israel's shame, and Balak's temporary advantage. But the hour of heavy retribution soon arrived; and on the day that saw the extermination of all the males in Midian, the flames of all their cities and goodly castles, the slaughter of their kings, the captivity of their women and children, and the spoiling of all their cattle, flocks, and goods,—Balaam also, the son of Beor, ended his iniquitous life, and was numbered with the slain.

Digitized by Google

Art. IV.—THE PSALMS.

In the times of the Fathers, men, full of the thoughts of Christ, could never read the Psalms without being reminded of their Lord. They probably had no system or fixed theory as to all the Psalms referring to Christ; but still, unthinkingly we might say, they found their thoughts wandering to their Lord, as, indeed, the one Person in whom these breathings, these praises, these desires, these hopes, these deep feelings, found their only true and full realization. Hence Augustine (Ps. lviii.) said to his hearers, as he expounded to them this book, that the voice of Christ and his Church was well-nigh the only voice to be heard in the Psalms—"*Vix est ut in Psalmis inveniamus vocem nisi Christi et Ecclesiæ;*" and on another occasion (Ps. xliii.), "Everywhere diffused throughout is that man whose Head is above, and whose members are below. We ought to recognise his voice in all the Psalms, either waking up the psaltery or uttering the deep groan—rejoicing in hope, or heaving sighs over present realities."

We set out with laying down no other principle of interpretation in regard to the speakers in these sacred songs, than this one,—viz., we must consider this book as "*not of private interpretation.*" (2 Pet. i. 20.) It is one of those writings which "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" and therefore it is decidedly erroneous to suppose, that because David, or any other, was the author, that therefore nothing is spoken of or sung but matters in which they were mainly or primarily concerned. "*Not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister,*" is true here also. (1 Pet. i. 12.) We cannot err far, therefore, if with Amyrauld we keep "our left eye on David, while we have our right eye full on Christ." In some instances, *the Head exclusively* speaks, or is spoken of; and in a few others *the members alone*. But generally, the strain is such in feeling and matter, that the Head and members together can use the harp and utter the song. And so important are they all, that nearly fifty of them are referred to in the New Testament.

Hengstenberg has evidently felt, in spite of his dread of admitting Messiah into the Psalms too often, that *one individual* was very generally present to the writer's mind. He is constrained to admit that reference is made to some *ideal* perfect one, or some *ideal* righteous one, who is the standard.*

* Another German writer, Baehr, treats *the cherubim* somewhat in the

Digitized by Google

Unwittingly he thus grants the fact, that none can read those songs of Zion without being led to think upon some one individual as the ever-recurring theme. And as the Scriptures do not speak in the style of philosophy, we may safely say, that the reference in all these cases is not to any *abstract* ideal person, but to the real living One, in whom all perfections meet, and against whom all the plots and malice of hell have ever been directed—*Messiah, the Righteous One.*

There is in almost every one of all these Psalms something that fitted them for the use of the past generations of the Church, something that fits them admirably still for the use of the Church now; while there is diffused also throughout a hint of the *future.* There is, we might say, a *past,* a *present,* and a *future* element. Few of them can be said to have no *prophetic* reference, no reference to generations or events yet to arise. And this last circumstance is one that gives them a claim upon the careful study of every one who searches into prophetic records.

Psalm I.

The first sound of the harp of the sweet singer of Israel might well be thought strange in a world lying in wickedness. It celebrates the present happiness (as Ps. xxiv. tells of the future bliss) of that man who has fellowship with God, and no fellowship with the ungodly.* Behold the man! his eye arrested, not by the things of earth, but by what has been sent down from heaven—"the law of the Lord." He has found the "river of living water;" he is like a tree—like some palm or pomegranate-tree, laden with fruit, or like that tree of life in Rev. xxii. 2, that yieldeth its fruit every month, and yieldeth fruit of all variety. "Every bud of it grows into a grain," says the Targum; "he is the very contrast to the barren fig-tree, withered by the curse," says a modern interpreter.

same manner. He says that the cherub is "the image of the creature in its highest form—an *ideal creature.*" What is this *ideal* of perfection in the *creature,* but just the *Redeemed Church?* And why are men reluctant to leave the abstractions of philosophy for the realities of revelation?

* Dr. Allix does not hesitate to apply it more specially to the Church in these latter days. "It containeth both the description of the happiness which the faithful Christians who apply themselves to their duty shall enjoy, as also those who with patience wait for the promises made unto them when Jesus Christ will come to reign upon the whole earth; and the misery of those who are of Antichrist's side, and who laugh at his coming."

Digitized by Google

Perhaps this comparison to the *tree and the streams* should carry us back to Eden, and suggest the state of man holy and happy there. Redeemed man rises up again to Eden-blessedness. Is it its use in this Psalm, or is it simply the expressiveness of the similitude, that has led to its repetition in Jer. xvii. 8? But besides, we are carried back to *Joshua* by the language used regarding the man's prosperity. Joshua's career was one of uninterrupted prosperity, except in one single case, when he forgot to consult the Lord; and the Lord's words to him were these:—

"This book of *the law* shall not depart out of thy mouth,
But thou shalt *meditate therein day and night,*
That thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein;
For then thou shalt *make thy way prosperous,*
And then thou shalt have good success."—(Josh. i. 8.)

Perhaps this reference to the days of Joshua made this Psalm the more appropriate as an introduction to the whole book. It connected these ancient days with other generations. It sang of the same Lord, acting toward men on the same principles. It sang of a race who had come to possess the land of Canaan, who acted on the holy maxims that guided Joshua when he took possession—a race of men guided by the revealed will of Jehovah.

The ungodly are not thus prosperous,—they are not as "trees by the river side." They are as "chaff," ready to be driven away in the day of wrath, and unable to resist the slightest breath of Jehovah's displeasure (Dan. ii. 35; Matt. iii. 12, the "day of decision"). They cannot "*stand,*" even as in Rev. vi. 17. The cry of the affrighted world—kings, captains, rich men, mighty men, bond, free—is, "The great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to *stand?*" For the "Lord *knoweth* the way of the righteous." Our Lord may have referred to this passage in his memorable expression so often used (Matt. vii. 23; Matt. xxv. 12; Luke xiii. 27), "*I never knew you—I know you not.*" O the happiness, then, of the godly! happy now, and still happier in that day which now hastens on, when the Husbandman shall separate "the chaff" from the wheat, and the kingdoms of earth be broken in pieces "like the chaff of the summer threshing-floor," and "the wind shall carry them away." O the folly of those who "*sit in the seat of the scorners,*" and ask in these last days (2 Pet. iii. 3), "Where is the promise of his coming?"

But now, as we have noticed that our Lord seems to quote

Digitized by Google

one of the expressions of this Psalm, let us ask how we may suppose it read by him in the days of his flesh. We know he read it; his delight was in the law of the Lord; and often has he quoted the book of Psalms. As he read, it would be necessary to his human soul to appropriate the blessedness pronounced on the godly; for he knew and felt himself to be indeed *the godly*, who "had not walked in the counsels of the ungodly, nor stood in the way of sinners, nor sat in the seat of the scornful." He felt himself able to say at all times, "Thy law is within my heart!" Was he not the true palm-tree? Was he not the true pomegranate-tree? Can we help thinking on him as alone realizing the description in this Psalm? The members of his body, in their measure, aim at his holy walk, but it is only in him that they see it perfectly exemplified. "*His leaf never withered;*" "he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth" (1 Peter ii. 22); "*he yielded his fruit in its season,*" obeying his mother Mary, and being found about his Father's business; going up to the feast "when his hour was come," and suffering, when the time appointed came; everything "in *season,*" and "*all he did prospered;*" he finished the work given him to do (John xvii. 4), and because of his completed work, "therefore God hath highly exalted him." (Philip. ii. 8, 9.) Barclay, who paraphrases the Psalms in verse, speaks of Christ, in allusion to ver. 4, as the Branch exalted to royal glory,—

"Like the tree of life by Eden's stream."

Having the imputed righteousness of this Saviour, we earnestly long to have his holiness imparted too; but, conscious that as yet he alone comes up to the picture drawn here, we cannot but inscribe as the title of this Psalm,

"*The way of the righteous One.*" 1 Cor. 9:21

Psalm II.

We have a quotation from this Psalm in Acts xiii. 33, where the best critics read, "as it is written in the *first* Psalm." It is not unlikely that it had at one time been considered as a second part of Psalm i., instead of standing as a separate hymn of praise. But, at all events, we may easily discover that it is an advance upon the preceding, placing before us the Righteous One in a new position. The view taken of Messiah by the world and by Jehovah is the theme; our eye is fixed on the purpose of Jehovah, triumphantly accomplished in Messiah's glory, in spite of all

Digitized by Google

opposition. The quotation of ver. 1, 2, in Acts iv. 23, guides us in asserting that it speaks of the fierce enmity of the world to the righteous One from the period of his first coming onward to his second appearing. The nations have raged, and the tribes of Israel (לְאֻמִּים) have agreed in hostility to the Lord's Messiah, ever since the day when Jew and Gentile met at Calvary to kill the Prince of life; and their rage is not evaporated, but shall be manifested more fiercely still when the beast and the false prophet lead on their hosts to Armageddon. It is quoted with reference to that day in Rev. ii. 27, and xix. 15,—"the rod of iron."

Perhaps the expression used so frequently in the epistles, "*fear and trembling*," is taken from ver. 11. It is used in exhortations to servants (Ephes. vi. 5) regarding duty; in Philip. ii. 13, to all believers engaged in striving for holiness; while in 1 Corinth. ii. 3, Paul describes his state of mind in his ministry at Corinth by these terms. May there not be a reference in all these, and similar passages, to our Psalm? It is as if it had been said, Remember our instructions for serving our King Messiah, in prospect of his glorious coming and kingdom—"serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling."

Even the Jews are pretty nearly agreed that no other than Messiah is the theme of the sweet singer of Israel here. "*Anointed*" is considered as decisive—it is *Messiah, Christ.* By some readers, however, the introduction of Christ by the name of "*Son,*" in ver. 7, and then in ver. 12, (where בַּר occurs, probably because poetical and lofty, as in Prov. xxxi. 2,) has been thought abrupt. But, abrupt as it may seem, there is no doubt hanging over the application; Messiah is "*my Son,*" and so exclusively pre-eminent in this, that Jehovah points to him, and calls on all men to honour the Son even as they honour the Father—"Kiss *the Son.*" Had not our Lord this very passage in his eye when he spoke these words (John v. 23): "The Father hath committed *all judgment* to the Son, that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father?" And it is thus we can understand how the term "*Father,*" as applied to Godhead, broke upon the ear of Israel without exciting surprise, when John the Baptist (John i. 18), spoke of the "only begotten *Son* who is in the bosom of *the Father.*" Son and Father were co-relative terms.

But let us proceed to examine the contents of this rich and lofty Psalm. The plan of it is simple, but very grand.

Digitized by Google

Messiah, on the morning when he broke the bands of death, is contemplating our world lying in wickedness. He beholds a sea of raging hatred and hostility dashing its angry waves on the throne of God and his anointed One.* He hears their scornful words, "Let us break their bands asunder," and marvels at their infatuation. For, lo! in the heavens above, Jehovah sits in long-suffering calmness, till their stubborn and long-lasting enmity compels him to arise against them. He "*troubles them*" (ver. 5) as he did the Egyptians at the Red Sea, and, referring to their haughty words, declares (ver. 6) they so speak. "And I (אֲנִי) in spite of them have set my king in Zion." They may try to make Rome, or any other city, their metropolis, and may set up a head to themselves, but Jehovah will set up his King, and make Zion—the platform of Jerusalem—his metropolis. From that city of the greater than David shall go forth the law. Yes, says Messiah, I will proclaim Jehovah's resolution; he has said to me, "Thou art my Son," &c. At his resurrection (Rom. i. 3) he was saluted as "*Son,*" because appearing there in his own proper array; no more hid in humiliation. He had been *Son* from eternity, but having dived under our ocean of sin and misery, his sonship seemed obscured till he emerged at his resurrection on the third day. (Acts xiii. 33.) And even so again, when he appears in glory at his coming, investing his own with their resurrection-dress—their array as adopted sons—the long-unseen Son of God shall be saluted as "my Son" by the Father when he places him on his visible throne. When that day shall come depends on his own request (ver. 8)—a request which he shall prefer whenever his purposes are ripe, and then he arises to shake terribly the earth. Does the reader not recognise in ver. 10, the voice of the tender, long-suffering, compassionate Saviour? It resembles his mode of expostulation in Proverbs i. 23, in prospect of that "*laugh*" which is referred to in ver. 26, as used by himself against his unyielding foes, even as by the Father. (Ver. 4.) Come, then, great and small, fall upon his neck, and be reconciled now. Be well pleased with him with whom the Father is well pleased; "kiss the Son,"—this is saving faith. For, "yet *a little while and his wrath shall be kindled.*" (Ver. 12.) Behold, he comes quickly! Blessed are all they who put their trust in him.

Whether, as Hengstenberg and many (or rather most)

* We might notice a reference to 1 Sam. ii. 10, the original source of "*anointed,*" if not of "*king,*" also in connexion with "*anointed.*"

Digitized by Google

other interpreters, we render ver. 12, "*A little while and his wrath shall be kindled,*" or retain the common version, there is, no doubt, a reference to be found to this verse in Rev. vi. 16, 17: "The wrath of the Lamb, . . . and who shall be able to stand?" And if the former rendering be adopted, as we believe it ought, then there is a tacit reference to this passage in the New Testament expression, Rev. xxii. 7, "I come quickly," come quickly to that Saviour for eternal life; for lo! he cometh quickly to deal with all who obey not the Gospel. Opposition ends in ruin; submission brings a blessedness, the fulness of which shall be known only on the day of wrath.

It is not to be forgotten that the time when Messiah utters these strains is supposed to be the time of his *resurrection.* This seems to be declared to us in Acts xiii. 33. He had felt the united assault of earth and hell, but had proved all to be vain; for he that sat in heaven had gloriously raised him from the dead, and his enemies had sunk to the ground as dead men. We might imagine this Psalm poured forth by him as he stood in Joseph's garden, beholding the empty sepulchre on the one hand, and the glory at the right hand of the Father on the other. It is thus we easily understand the words in ver. 7: "*This day* have I begotten thee;" the Father declaring him his "*only begotten,*" by raising him from the dead, and doing this as a pledge of his farther exaltation,—placing him (ver. 8) in the position of *Intercessor,* ere he shall arise to return as acknowledged Conqueror and King.

Glancing back now upon Psalm i., in connexion with this more lofty and triumphant song, we see how appropriately the book of Israel's sacred songs has begun. It has sketched to us the calm, holy path of the righteous, and then the final results in the day of victory, when the Anointed shall have put down all enemies, and the way of the ungodly shall have perished. We are afterwards to meet with these topics continually recurring in the course of the whole book; it was good, then, to present an epitome at the outset.

Glancing back, too, upon the contents of the Psalm more immediately under consideration, we see, at the beginning and end of it, links of connexion with the preceding, in such expressions as ver. 1, "*meditating* a vain thing," in contrast to the *meditating* on the law (Ps. i. 3), while "the way of the ungodly shall *perish,*" in Psalm i. 8, is brought to mind when we read in ver. 12 of "their *perishing from the way.*" Our Lord, when on earth, might read this as his

Digitized by Google

history,—the righteous One, who ever meditated on the law of the Lord, and kept aloof from the vain meditations of the heathen, exalted at length to honour. For here we have Messiah, the head of every one who seeks Jehovah's face, exhibited in his majesty, and in full prospect of final triumph. The subject of the whole may thus be said to be the assertion of "the righteous One's claims to the throne." Some one has proposed to entitle it rather, "*the eternal decree*," in reference to ver. 6, of which the Psalm might be spoken of as the development. But inasmuch as the Eternal decree forms only one topic, while the burden is Messiah himself directly, it is undoubtedly more exact and descriptive to give as its title,

"*The righteous One's sure exaltation to the throne.*"

Psalm III.

It may be so, that this Psalm was written by David, "when *he fled from Absalom his son.*" The Holy Ghost may have used these circumstances in David's lot, as appropriate for such a hymn of hopeful confidence in the Lord. The connexion, too, with Psalm ii., is natural, whether we look to David's case when he penned it, or to the more general circumstances referred to throughout. When the men of Israel refused David as "King in Zion," though the type of a greater King, it was natural for him to raise the cry to the Lord, "*Lord, how are they increased that trouble me.*" (Compare 2 Sam. xv. 12.) And not less natural is it to place this cry next to the closing call in Psalm ii. 10, 11, when men despised that call and plotted against Jehovah and his Christ. Hengstenberg has remarked:—"It is certainly not to be regarded as an accident that Psalms the third and fourth follow immediately the first and second. They, as well as Psalm second, are occupied with a revolt against the Lord's Anointed. And when, in ver. 8, the enemy is spoken of as '*smitten on the cheek-bone, and his teeth broken,*' there is the same tone of conscious safety, mingled with contempt of their efforts, as in the '*laugh*' of Psalm ii."

It is a Psalm that may be found most suitable and needful in the latter days. When waves of sorrow and calamity are dashing over the ship of the Church, it may borrow from this Psalm that ground of hope which long ago Jonah borrowed from it in his strange trial, "*Salvation is of the Lord.*" (Jonah ii. 9.)

Digitized by Google

It seems to be a *morning hymn* (ver. 5). Every member of Christ may use it; and we can easily see how the Head himself could adopt it as his own. We feel as if sympathy were more sure to us, when we know that the Lord Jesus himself once was in circumstances when such a morning hymn expressed his state and feelings; for now every believer can say, " My Head once used this Psalm; and when I use its strains, his human heart will recall the day of his humiliation, when himself was comforted thereby."

Viewing this as, in its full sense, properly the words of our Lord in the days of his flesh, we entitle it, " *The righteous One's safety amid foes.*" Who more truly than he could say of his foes, " *How many!*" since it was " *the world*" that hated him. (John vii. 7.) On the cross, did they not upbraid him with the taunt, " There is no salvation for him in God" (ver. 2), when they cast in his teeth, " *If he will have him*" (Matt. xxvii. 43); saying it not only *of* him, but *to* him? (See Hengstenberg.) But as in Psalm xxii., he cried —he made it his habit to cry the more his foes reviled— " *I cry*—he *heareth.*" Often did he retire to the Mount of Olives, and either amid its olives or at Bethany, " lay down and slept," after enduring the contradiction of sinners all day long; yes, even after such a day as that whereon they took up stones to stone him. He foresaw the ruin of these foes (vers. 7, 8), when the Lord should arise.* What a victory! and all the glory of it belonging to the Lord, and all the blessing to his people! (Ver. 9.)

A believer can take up every clause, and sing it all in sympathy with his Head; hated by the same world that hated him; loved and kept by the same Father that lifted up his head; heard and answered and sustained as he was, and entering with him on final victory in the latter day. In their case, too, even as in his, it was fitting to put the arresting mark, " *Selah,*" at ver. 2, where the foes are spoken of; at ver. 4, where the cry and its answer are declared; and at ver. 9, where the final result appears. Each " *Selah*" (marking a proper place to pause and ponder—*Hengstenberg*) stops us at a scene spread before our eyes sufficient for the time; *first,* the hosts of foes, as far as eye can reach; *next,* the one suppliant crying into the ears of the Lord of hosts;

* The English Prayer-Book translation is, " Up, Lord, and help me;" reminding us of the sudden unexpected rise of the Guards at Waterloo, after long and patient waiting for the seasonable moment.

Digitized by Google

and, *lastly*, that one suppliant's secure repose, certain of present safety and future triumph. May we not, then, justly entitle this Psalm,

"*The righteous One's safety amid foes?*"

ART. V.—THE SEVEN TRUMPETS.*

THE remarkable agreement between the pages of Gibbon and the visions of the Apocalypse, has often been noticed as a striking illustration of an overruling Providence, commanding praise even from the mouth of an enemy. For it is not merely the coincidence between the facts predicted and the facts narrated which has attracted observation, but the correspondence between the illustrative figures employed by the infidel historian to give prominence to the events passing under his review, and the symbols under which these very events were revealed by the Almighty to the apostle. The title-page of Mr. Birks's work shows that the leading idea under which it was composed, was to bring out this agreement; but we think that, by adhering too closely to this single intention, he has somewhat injured his exposition. Had he drawn his illustrations less exclusively from Gibbon, he would have imparted greater variety and interest to his work. Had he been less solicitous about so arranging the prophecy as that each verse, as it were, should have its interpretative chapter from the historian, we think he would have avoided some errors; for it has been more than once suggested to us, during our perusal of the work, that the author was rather endeavouring to adapt the Apocalypse to Gibbon, than simply drawing his illustrations from the latter. Nor would it have been necessary to sacrifice any part of the argument which may be drawn from the coincidences between the one and the other. These might all have been noticed, might all have received their due weight, without being made the pivots upon which the whole exposition turns. But it is proper to remark, that the defects to which we have alluded are more apparent in the minor details than

* "The Mystery of Providence; or, the Prophetic History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire: an Historical Exposition of Rev. viii., ix." By the Rev. T. R. Birks, Rector of Kelshall, Herts. London: James Nisbet and Co.

Digitized by Google

in the leading features of his interpretation, to which, without further delay, we shall introduce our readers.

We agree with Mr. Birks in the great principle on which he builds this exposition of the Trumpets, namely, that the seals and the trumpets do not form one continuous series, but two separate series, which run parallel the one with the other. But we do not see that there is any necessity for believing that the two series commence at the same epoch. It is perfectly possible that they *may* do so; but it is a question which must be determined from the prophecy itself. Leaving this matter open for future investigation, we must next express our dissent from the manner in which our author treats the introductory vision of the angel, offering incense at the golden altar, and then casting the censer into the earth. He supposes the intercession of the angel to denote "a solemn pause of delay before the trumpet-angels are permitted to sound. The signal," he says, "is not given until the prayers of the saints, as their sufferings are prolonged, assume more and more the tone of earnest entreaty, and humble expostulation, at the sight of boastful and triumphant ungodliness, and thus rise, like a thick cloud of incense, before the throne of the Most High." (p. 14.) He holds that this pause extends from the time when the Apocalypse was revealed, unto the death of Aurelian, and that the "voices, thunders, lightnings, and earthquake," which followed the descent of the coals from the altar, answer to the civil discords which prevailed from that time until the murder of Alexander, and to the popular insurrection which broke forth during the reign of his successor, Maximin. We cannot, however, admit that any historical interpretation ought to be attempted of the prefatory vision which introduces the series of trumpets. No commentator, so far as we are aware, has thought it incumbent upon him to find a fulfilment, in the annals of the Roman Empire, of the theophany which forms the preface to the whole prophecy, or of the vision of the Lamb, which introduces that of the seven-sealed book. If, then, we are to be called upon to find events to correspond with the angel's intercession, and the other subsequent incidents, we must, in our turn, call upon the author of such a scheme, whether he be Mr. Birks or Mr. Elliott, to tell us what portion of the world's, or of the Church's history, is symbolically represented by the proclamation made for one to open the book, by the Lamb's taking that book, and by the ascription of praise to the

Digitized by Google

Redeemer on that event by all created beings. To us it appears obvious, from the construction of the Apocalypse, that the vision of the interceding angel is intended as an introduction to the trumpets, for the purpose of setting forth their character, and exhibiting a synopsis, as it were, of the consequences of the seven trumpet-blasts. The coals of fire falling on the earth, and the voices, thunderings, lightnings, and earthquake, which follow, are the compendium of the trumpets which succeed them; and there seems, therefore, to be nothing so unnatural, as Mr. Birks supposes (p. 33), in holding that these voices and other signs are the same as those recorded under the seventh trumpet, and again under the seventh vial, which is itself contained in the seventh trumpet. Indeed, we look upon the coincidence as most valuable for the purpose of assigning its proper place to the series of vials, by showing that the end to be accomplished by the sounding of the trumpets, was not fulfilled till the last vial was poured out.

If, from the vision prefatory to the trumpets, we are to draw any conclusions as to the character of the whole trumpet-series, it becomes necessary to examine it more closely; and we cannot avoid remarking its resemblance, noted by Mr. Birks, to the vision in the opening chapters of Ezekiel's prophecy. There, God's desertion of Israel, and the judgments he was about to bring upon the guilty nation, are represented by the symbol of coals of fire, taken from the altar, and scattered over the city; and there, too, as in the Apocalyptic visions, one is sent to set a seal upon the foreheads of those who sighed for all the abominations that were done; while six others, answering probably to the first six trumpet-angels, are ordered to follow him and smite all who are not sealed. Nor is the offering of incense wanting, for in the previous chapter (Ezek. viii. 11, 12), the prophet sees seventy men of the ancients of the house of Israel engaged in idolatrous services, "every man his censer in his hand, and a thick cloud of incense went up." This, among other abominations, was the procuring cause of God's judgments upon Jerusalem; and when we compare the vision with that revealed to the apostle, we can scarcely avoid the conclusion drawn by Mr. Elliott, that in the ministering of the angel-priest, there is an allusion, by contrast, to the worship of saints and angels, introduced into the Christian Church, and which brought that Church into a position of apostasy, exactly parallel to that of Israel of old. (Hor. Apoc., vol. i., pp. 291—317.) It is natural that Mr. Birks

Digitized by Google

should reject this allusion as he does (p. 15), because he would carry back the vision to an earlier period; but even if we were to join with him in refusing to admit it, we would at least argue that the prefatory vision gives to the trumpets which succeed it, the character of judgments on a Christian community, and not on a heathen empire, and we would charge his work with inconsistency in referring the earlier trumpets to the Pagan, and the later to the Christian empire of Rome. In connexion with this view, it is interesting to remark, that it has been noticed that in the seven trumpets there is an apparent allusion to the fact that, in pronouncing sentence of excommunication among the Jews, the priest was accustomed to sound a trumpet, and, in extraordinary cases, many trumpets.* The seven Apocalyptic trumpets may be regarded, therefore, as so many blasts of excommunication directed against those having a Christian profession, and parallel exactly to the act by which Israel was cut off from God's favour and sent into captivity.

Before fixing the time at which the acts of judgment commenced, it will be necessary to advert to the imagery of the vision. The trumpets bring their plagues upon a mimic universe, consisting of the earth, sea, rivers, and celestial luminaries; and as each of the first four trumpets is directed against one of these constituent elements, we must assign a definite interpretation to each. Mr. Elliott, avowing the principle that all the particulars of a prophecy are not necessarily symbolical, because the principal parts of it are so, interprets the first three geographically, and the last symbolically. We do not think that he has been successful in defending his position, and are disposed rather to agree with Mr. Birks, who interprets the whole as a compound emblem. Some exceptions may, however, be taken to his explanation of the individual symbols, as we shall see in the sequel; but in the meantime, we shall place before our readers a somewhat modified interpretation, which we think is free from some of these difficulties. The universe, then, being the Roman empire, the earth will be the seats of men therein: and the grass and trees will be the products of the earth, divided into articles of necessity and of luxury. The sea, with its ships, represents the commerce of the empire; the rivers and fountains of water, the sources of public instruction; and the celestial luminaries, its dignitaries, civil and ecclesiastical. If it be said that here there is a mixture

* Lampe's Exercitationes ad Psal. xlv., quoted by Wolf in his Curæ Philolog.

Digitized by Google

of the symbolical and the literal, we reply, that it is only in appearance, for, where the sign and the thing signified are so nearly alike as in the present instance, there must be some portions of the picture which must approach very close to actual identity. With regard to the very peculiar restriction by which the action of five of the trumpets is confined to the *third part* of the earth, we think there is much force in Mr. Birks's remark, that, in all the cases where the fractional part is mentioned, it ought to be understood of the *same* portion of the empire. The inevitable conclusion is, that it must denote the *eastern* portion of the Roman dominions, for this alone was affected by the sixth trumpet; and, in fact, in all the tripartite divisions of the empire which took place, the East was always one of the three portions. We cannot, however, see that there is any allusion in this prophetic phrase to Daniel's four empires, and that the Greek empire, because the third in order, is here called the third part; or that the Roman empire, in like manner, in the fifth chapter, is called the fourth part of the earth, because the fourth in succession of these kingdoms. It is, however, unnecessary to argue the point, as we agree in the conclusion to which our author has come.

We have now to fix the time at which the historical fulfilment of the first trumpet took place. None, we think, will be disposed to deny that hail and fire, mingled with blood, fitly indicate an irruption of northern barbarians into the empire; but we shall, perhaps, be able to show that the hostile invasions which occurred A.D. 250—268, and to which Mr. Birks refers the symbol, do not meet the requirements of the prophecy. For, in the first place, the trumpets, as we have shown, appear to be directed against a *professedly Christian* community; but the empire did not become Christian till about the year A.D. 320. Secondly, as the third part of the earth is referred to in such a marked manner, it seems natural to place the sounding of this trumpet after the time of the division of the empire. Thirdly, by placing it as early as Mr. Birks does, a space is left between the first and the second trumpet, which he treats of in the next chapter as "the pause of judgment," but for which there is not the slightest warrant in the vision. The empire was divided by Valentinian and Valens, A.D. 364, and again and finally, by Theodosius, A.D. 395. From the first of these periods till the fall of the Western empire (A.D. 476), one incursion of barbarians followed another, and these invasions, so far as they related to the Eastern empire, to which they gave the

Digitized by Google

first blow, we hold to be comprehended under the first trumpet. Let us notice, as shortly as we can, these various wars. The very year of the division of the empire by Valentinian, "the barbarians burst into the empire from all quarters.* In the year A.D. 378, Gratian, Emperor of the West, "alarmed at the danger that threatened the eastern provinces, harassed by the barbarians, marched to the assistance of Valentinian." (U. H. p. 271.) Next year we are told that "Dacia, Thrace, and Illyricum, were already lost." (p. 278.) In the year A.D. 395, Alaric devastated the whole country between Dalmatia, the Adriatic Gulf, and the Euxine, and the city of Constantinople was in a manner besieged. (p. 331.) The Hunns now came upon the stage, and in the year A.D. 425, laid waste the whole of Thrace, and threatened Constantinople with a siege. Then followed the ravages of Attila (p. 403), who died in 453, and on his death, several of the nations who had formed part of his vast empire, settled permanently in Thrace and Illyricum; and the hail-storm was closed by Genseric, who, in 467, ravaged the Peloponnesus and Greek islands, an affront which the Emperor Leo in vain attempted to avenge. (p. 429.)

The effects of these northern invasions on the Eastern empire is well described by a recent author, whose work forms a useful commentary on this portion of the Apocalypse.† He tells us that the mass of the population of Greece never attained again their former prosperous condition, and quotes, in illustration, a law exempting the cities of Illyricum from contributing to the expense of the public spectacles, because of the ravages of the Goths; another law, proving that many estates were without owners; and a third, relieving Greece from two-thirds of the ordinary contributions to Government.

The only objection which we can conceive to this interpretation of the first trumpet is, that the worship of saints, which we hold with Elliott to be alluded to by contrast in the vision of the interceding angel, did not commence until a date later than that which we have assigned to the first of the judgments which were its consequence. But this objection will be found to have no great weight. It is universally admitted that the invocation of saints became prevalent during the fourth century, and there is the strongest reason for believing that it had been introduced into the Church even before the time of Constantine, for we find from

* Univ. History, vol. xiv. p. 232.
† Finlay's Greece under the Romans.

Digitized by Google

Mosheim that as early as the year 305, the Council of Elvira in Spain forbad the adoration of images.* This, of course, was more than half a century before the division of the empire.

But there is another matter connected with this trumpet to which it is necessary to call attention. The effects of the hailstorm are said to be that the third part of trees was burnt up, and *all* green grass was burnt up. Mr. Birks understands by the grass the perishable population of the Roman world, according to the words of the prophet, "All flesh is grass;" yet he would admit also, as contained in the symbol, the natural fertility of the soil. (p. 57.) In his exposition of the trees he is less consistent. In one place (p. 57) he interprets them as the nobles and magistrates of the land; in another (p. 71) he seems to identify them with the "noblest institutions of civilization and art, the *trees* which adorned the Pagan idolatry, and sheltered its mysterious rites." But, taking either interpretation, he fails in bringing out a consistent meaning from the symbolic fact, that, while the third part of the trees was burned up, *all* green grass was destroyed. This would imply that the visitation of the northern barbarians fell most heavily upon the eastern empire, in which both grass and trees were destroyed, and with less severity on the west, where only the grass was burnt up. This was certainly not the case at the period to which *he* applies the vision, nor was it so during the barbaric invasions which, according to *our* scheme, were prefigured by it. These irruptions issued in the overthrow of the *western*, but not the eastern empire, which alone succeeded in driving back the barbarians, and preserving its population free from any admixture of the Gothic race, whereas, to meet the apparent requirements of the vision, the case should have been reversed. This leads us to propose a different interpretation, which, so far as we know, has not hitherto been brought forward. The irruptions of the barbarian hordes into the *western* empire after its division from the eastern, form no part of this prophecy. They are predicted in another portion of the Apocalypse. But the series of judgments symbolized by the trumpets may have had their commencement some time anterior to the division of the empire, as soon, indeed, as Christianity became so corrupt as to call for them. Now, the empire became Christian A.D. 325, and if, between that date and the division of the empire in 364, the same hailstorm, whose effects we have been contemplating, did in some measure desolate the west,

* Mosheim. Chronological Tables of the Fourth Century.

Digitized by Google

that event would fall under the first trumpet, while the further effects of that desolating scourge would be withdrawn from the eye of the apostolic prophet, who, after the date of the division of the empire only contemplated the east as the scene of the trumpet-vision. And so we find that in 331, the fertile plains of Gaul, from which Rome drew a large portion of its subsistence, were ravaged by the Franks.* In 351, the battle of the Mursa, described as fatal to the empire (U. H. p. 142), from the immense slaughter of its troops, was fought between the imperial armies and the forces of the usurper, Magnentius, composed of Romans, *Germans, Gauls, Franks*, and *Britons*. In 353, Gaul was again ravaged by the barbarians, and the disbanded troops of Magnentius, while in the next year another hostile inroad was made by the Franks, Alemans, and Saxons, who besieged Autun in 356. At the same time the Quadi and Sarmatians entered Pannonia, and laid all waste before them. The danger of the empire was the cause of Julian's elevation to the dignity of Cæsar (p. 160), and the campaigns of that prince in Gaul and Germany give sufficient evidence of the severity of the northern storm. A circumstance, curiously illustrative of the prophecy, is to be found in the fact that, in 359, so completely exhausted had Gaul become, that Julian could not find provisions for his army, and ordered six or eight hundred vessels to be built in Britain for conveying *corn* from thence into Gaul, while he made it a condition of submission with all the German chiefs, that they should furnish a certain quantity of corn when required. (pp. 172, 173.) Thus, in the west, as well as the east, the green grass was burnt up, but when the storm became more serious, and the trees began to fall before the gale, the larger portion of the symbolic universe was shrouded from the view of the seer, and it was only on the third part of the earth that he could trace the course of the calamity.

The next chapter in Mr. Birks's work is entitled, "The Pause of Judgment." We have already remarked that it is an interpolation in the interpretation which has no place in the original, and is rendered necessary only by his unfortunate antedating of the period of the first trumpet. He extends this pause from A.D. 270 to 365.

We may then pass at once to the second trumpet, in the interpretation of which we agree in the main with Mr. Birks, although we think that he has embarrassed his exposition by an erroneous rendering of some of the minor symbols of the

* Univ. Hist., vol. xiv., p. 129.

Digitized by Google

vision. A burning mountain is cast into the sea, by which the third part of it is turned into blood, the third part of living creatures in the sea killed, and the third part of ships destroyed. The event here predicted, our author views, and we think correctly, as the extinction of the western empire, building his exposition chiefly upon the parallel passage in Jer. xxi. 25: "Behold, I am against thee, O destroying mountain, saith the Lord, which destroyed the whole earth; and I will stretch out my hand against thee, and roll thee down from the rocks, and make thee a burnt mountain. And they shall not take of thee a stone for a corner, or a stone for a foundation, but thou shalt be desolate for ever, saith the Lord." His error, we conceive, lies in his regarding this event as the main object of the prophecy; whereas it seems clear that the prediction only contemplates the *effects* of the fall of Rome upon the eastern empire. Into this error, Mr. Birks has been naturally led by the signification which he has attached to the symbolic sea. According to him, "the sea implies a season of anarchy and confusion" (p. 106), in contradistinction to the earth, which denotes "nations under fixed laws and a settled government." (p. 56.) Again, he tells us that "by the sea is prefigured the multitude of barbarous nations who were to come up like a deluge against the empire" (p. 110); and yet again, the third part of the sea "signifies those barbarous tribes, which, by treaty, local situation, or immediate dependance, were connected with the Greek empire, or the population of that empire itself when reduced to a state of anarchy and confusion." (p. 113.) Now, we have some doubts whether the sea ever in symbolical prophecy bears this interpretation, and, at all events, we are satisfied that it cannot, when it is part of a symbolic universe. The earth and sea are *co-existent* parts of the same universe, and not successive conditions of a portion of it. Moreover, there should be some congruity between the interpretation of the sea, and of the ships which sail on it; but Mr. Birks, while he views the former as signifying the barbarian nations, interprets the latter of the commerce of the eastern empire. And yet farther, by this unfortunate rendering of the symbol, our author does in effect make the second trumpet the swallowing up of the mountain by the sea, instead of the turning of the sea into blood by the fall of the mountain into it, while the third part of the earth, or the eastern empire, is affected only by the waters of the sea, or incursions of barbarians, first settling within its bounds, and then revolting against the imperial authority.

Digitized by Google

A much more natural interpretation results from considering the sea, the creatures inhabiting it, and the ships, according to the scheme we laid down at the outset, as denoting the *commerce of the empire*. The barbaric invasions of the eastern empire, so graphically depicted under the first trumpet, were accompanied by similar invasions of the western empire, by which it was ultimately overthrown. These, however, are passed over in silence in this portion of the prophecy, which deals only with the history of the east. But the fall of Rome under Augustulus (A.D. 476) was the second great blow which was dealt to the empire of the east, and therefore falls within the range of the trumpet-visions. Most appropriate is the imagery by which it is denoted. We have supposed that the western portion of the mimic universe was shrouded from the view of the apostle after the date of the division of the empire. The hailstorm had nearly passed away, when, on the skirts of the darkness which bounded his prospect, a vast mountain is seen blazing with fire. It is cast into the sea, and immediately so much of it as belongs to "the third part," is turned to blood. Historians have unfortunately left us but very slender data for estimating the amount, or the channels, of the commerce of the empire. We know, however, that previous to the fall of Rome, the carrying trade to the west had fallen entirely into the hands of the subjects of the eastern empire, principally of the Greeks. When, therefore, the luxurious habits of the Romans were supplanted by the simpler tastes of the Goths and Vandals, this source of subsistence must have been suddenly cut off, and thousands plunged into utter destitution. Add to this, that Italy had not merely changed her population, but was in many parts depopulated altogether, and we shall see how severe a blow must have been dealt to the eastern empire. "*Vides universa Italiae loca viduata cultoribus, et illa mater humanae messis Liguria, cui numerosa agricolarum solebat constare progenies, orbata atque sterilis, jejunum cespitem nostris monstrat obtutibus.*" "St. Ambrose," says Gibbon, "has deplored the ruin of a populous district which had been once adorned with the flourishing cities of Bologna, Modena, Regium, and Placentia. Pope Gelasius was a subject of Odoacer, and he affirms with strong exaggeration, that in Æmilia, Tuscany, and the adjacent provinces, the human species was almost extirpated." The expeditions of Justinian into Africa and Italy, and the effect which his success had in improving the condition of the mercantile and manufacturing portion of the Greek popula-

Digitized by Google

tion, by extending its direct relations with the West,* proves how much these interests must have already suffered.

"The subjects of Justinian," says Gibbon, when introducing the history of these expeditions, "were dissatisfied with the times and with the Government. Europe was overrun by the barbarians, and Asia by the monks. *The poverty of the West discouraged the trade and manufactures of the East.*" The whole commercial body appear to have desired his success, and on the approach of Belisarius, many of the merchants of Carthage were thrown into prison on suspicion of secretly favouring him.†

In treating of the third trumpet, Mr. Birks debates the question, whether the fall of the star from heaven denotes religious or political changes, and decides in favour of the former. The star, according to him, is Nestorius; and the embittered waters denote the acrimony of religious faction engendered by his fall. It is, however, an objection to this interpretation, that the date of the deposition of Nestorius, when, according to our author (p. 181), "the blast of the third trumpet began," was A.D. 431, while the fall of Rome, the event symbolized by the *previous* trumpet, did not occur till A.D. 476. At the same time, the consequences which arose out of the Nestorian controversy, answer so exactly to the Apocalyptic emblem, that this interpretation must not be hastily cast aside. And, moreover, we find that these ecclesiastical divisions are properly the *third*, and not the *second* great blow inflicted on the eastern empire, seeing that the political evils which flowed from them were only developed in the course of the following century. Let us hastily enumerate the leading points of this controversy, so discreditable to the Church. In 431, Nestorius was deposed, and in 449, Eutychus, who had gone to the other extreme of error, met with the same fate. For thirty years discord prevailed over the East, and in 482, the Emperor Zeno put forth his *Henoticon*, by which he attempted to reconcile the contending parties, but in vain. New sects and new disputes arose, which it were tedious to detail, and the fate of the empire now began to be visibly influenced by this religious controversy. "The sixth century," says an author from whom we have already more than once quoted, "gave strong proofs of the necessity, that each country which possessed a peculiar language and literature, should possess also its National Church; and the struggle of the Roman empire, and of the Greek ecclesiastical establishment, against this attempt at

* See Finlay's "Greece." † Ibid.

Digitized by Google

national independence, on the part of the Armenians, Syrians, Egyptians, Africans, and Italians, involved the empire in many difficulties, and opened a way, first for the Persians to push their invasions into the heart of the empire, and afterwards for the Mahometans to conquer the eastern provinces." * It was, probably, as much from national jealousy as religious convictions, that the Syrians became Jacobites, the Egyptians Eutychians, the Armenians Monophysites, the Persians and Chaldeans Nestorians, while the Greeks alone preserved the doctrines of the orthodox Church. The great object of the Emperor Maurice, whose reign lasted from 582 to 602, was, according to Mr. Finlay, to prevent the Nestorians and Eutychians from forming separate states. In this he was foiled by a rebellion, which embodied the popular hostility to the existing order of administration to the ruling aristocracy, and to the Greek party in the National Church. The abilities of Heraclius were directed to the same end, though after a different manner. Maurice had attempted to restore the discipline of the army, that he might overawe the Syrians and Egyptians by military force. Heraclius endeavoured to form a creed in which all his subjects might unite. The attempt ended in a signal failure; the Emperor was stigmatized as a heretic, and, while the hostility of the other sects remained unabated, a new schism was introduced, which still further weakened the empire. The Chaldeans, Syrians, Egyptians, and Armenians, now became virtually independent, and welcomed the Persian monarch in his advances against the empire. And all these calamities were attributable to the bitterness of the waters, occasioned by the star which fell from heaven.

The eastern empire now hastens in its decline: and the fourth trumpet brings before us the extinction of its sun. Our limits admonish us of the necessity of brevity, and therefore, without following our author in his exposition, we shall at once quote a passage, which we deem highly illustrative, from Mr. Finlay's "Greece under the Romans:"—"If manners, language, and religion are to decide the commencement of the Byzantine empire, it must be carried back earlier: if the peculiarities of the form of government are to determine it, it may be indefinitely prolonged. The period, therefore, at which the *Roman* empire of the east terminated, is decided by the events which confined the authority of the Government to those provinces where the Greeks formed the majority of the population. . . . . Goths, Hunns, Avars,

* Finlay's "Greece."

Digitized by Google

Persians, all failed as completely in overthrowing the Roman empire, as the Mahommedans did in destroying the Christian Church." He then fixes the end of the reign of Justinian II. as the termination of the Roman empire in the east, and names Leo, the Isaurian, as the first Byzantine monarch:—"During the period which elapsed between the death of Heraclius and the accession of Leo, the few remains of Roman principles of administration which had lingered in the Imperial Court were gradually extinguished. The long-cherished hope of restoring the ancient power and glory of the Roman empire expired, and even the aristocracy, which always clings to the last to antiquated forms and ideas, no longer dwelt with confidence on the memory of former days. The conviction that the empire had undergone a great moral and political change, which severed the future irrevocably from the past, though it was probably not fully understood, was at least felt and acted upon, both by the people and the Government. *The sad fact that* THE SPLENDID SUN *which had illuminated the ancient world had now set as completely at Constantinople as at Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, and Carthage, was too evident to be longer doubted. The very* TWILIGHT *of antiquity had faded into* DARKNESS."*

The author from whom these remarks have been quoted, fixes the close of the Roman empire in the east so late as A.D. 711, at the death of Justinian II. He admits, however, that this event may be placed earlier or later, according to the point of view from which we regard it. The latter part of the reign of Heraclius, who died in 642, is an epoch which is in itself unexceptionable, and suits well with the remainder of the Apocalyptic vision. We cannot fix the period of the eclipse sooner; for the brilliant successes of Heraclius against the Persians sustained for a season the expiring glories of the Roman empire. Nor need we postpone it; for before the death of that Emperor he had sunk to be the prince of a petty kingdom. Omar, in his letter to Heraclius, quoted by Mr. Birks (p. 280), gives him the title of the *King of Greece*. It was upon the Byzantine empire, or the Greek kingdom, that the two next trumpet-plagues—the locusts and Euphratean horsemen—were inflicted: and the distinct character of the first four trumpets, as compared with the succeeding ones, is marked in the vision by an angel, or perhaps an eagle, flying in the midst of heaven, and giving warning of approaching woes. Exactly in the same manner, as Mr. Birks strikingly remarks, the historian Gibbon, having

* Finlay's "Greece," p. 505.

Digitized by Google

brought down his narrative to the death of Heraclius, pauses to inform his readers that he now finds it necessary to "establish the plan of the remaining part of his work" on a new principle, because the succession of Byzantine emperors would not reward a more minute investigation.

We would willingly have followed our author through the remainder of his exposition, but as his general views of the fifth and sixth trumpets agree with the interpretation commonly received, we prefer employing the space which remains to us in making a comparison between Mr. Birks's interpretation of the first four trumpets and that of Mr. Elliott. Let us, in a single sentence, state the former, with the slight emendations we have made upon it in the preceding pages. The Eastern Empire is represented as the third part of a mimic world; the internal resources of it being figured by the grass and trees; its commerce by the sea and ships; its provisions for religious instruction by the rivers and fountains; and its governing powers by the sun and moon. Each of these is successively effected. A hail-storm, or the invasion of the northern barbarians, injures the first. The fall of the Western Empire, depicted under the image of a great mountain, all but annihilates its commerce. The bitterness of religious strife is brought into the Church by the Nestorian and cognate heresies, which also alienated the provinces of the East; and at last the sun of the Constantinopolitan empire is quenched in night. On turning to Mr. Elliott's exposition, we find that he argues for the *Gothic* application of the trumpets, first, because the course of his previous exposition has brought him exactly to this point of the history. As we do not agree with him in his view of the latter seals, we can allow no weight to this argument. Next, taking for granted the application of the fourth trumpet to the extinction of the western Cæsars (in which interpretation he is opposed by Mr. Birks), he admits that the symbols of the first three trumpets have such a measure of similarity of character as to preclude them from furnishing any decisive distinctions by which their application to the several invading powers may be ascertained. We need not point out how remarkably the reverse is the case in Mr. Birks's exposition. There being, according to Mr. Elliott, this uncertainty in the application, he has recourse to the geographical distinctions of "*the third part of the trees and of the land;*" "*the third part of the sea,*" and "*the third part of the rivers,*" as what is to furnish him with the means of fixing a definite fulfilment to each trumpet. Admitting, for the

Digitized by Google

sake of argument, that such geographical distinctions are to be found in the vision, let us inquire, whether, in his exposition, Mr. Elliott makes these distinctions to agree with the truth of history. According to him, the first trumpet depicts the invasions of Alaric and Rhadagisus, and the scene of its devastations is the western third of the empire, Rhætia, Italy, Gaul, and Spain. The second trumpet brings on the stage the Vandal Genseric, and his appointed prey is the maritime provinces of the western third of the empire. The third trumpet is fulfilled by Attila, the Hunn, whose commission is to devastate the river-provinces of the western empire, the banks of the Upper Danube, the Rhine, and the Alpine fountains of water. The fourth trumpet brings before us the extinction of the western empire by Odoacer. This scheme is sufficiently imposing, especially when expounded by the eloquent pen of Mr. Elliott, and probably all readers of his work will remember the chapter on the first four trumpets, as one of the most striking it contains. A closer examination will, however, throw some doubt on its correctness.

The several invading barbarians did not confine their assaults to the portion of the empire assigned to them. Not to mention that the Goths had oftentimes invaded the empire before the time of Alaric, that chief directed his first efforts against the *Eastern* Empire, and in 395 devastated the whole country between Dalmatia, the Adriatic Gulf, and the Euxine Sea,—in a manner besieging the city of Constantinople itself. Shortly afterwards, under Gainas and Trebigild, the Goths laid waste Asia Minor, ravaged Thrace, and threatened to seize Constantinople; so that the hail-storm might well have been said to have afflicted the *whole* empire, and not merely the western third. Again, the Vandals did not direct their first assaults upon the empire against the maritime provinces. During the time of Alaric's invasions they had crossed the Rhine, ravaged Gaul and Germania Prima, crossed the Pyrenees, and occupied Spain. Nor were their subsequent ravages confined to the maritime provinces of the west, or even to the sea-coast at all. In 455, Genseric took and pillaged Rome, and in 467 ravaged the Peloponnesus and Greek islands; and when Leo, Emperor of the East, threatened to make war upon him, he replied by sending his fleet to pillage the coasts of Greece, and the other maritime provinces of the eastern empire. And when, at a later period, he had secured the islands between Africa and Italy, he "yearly sent fleets to ravage the coasts of Italy, of the Peloponnesus, and the Greek islands, *equally despising both Emperors, and bidding defiance*

Digitized by Google

to their power." * Lastly, in regard to the Hunns, the reality still more exceeds the supposed symbolical description. For, before the time of Attila, and contemporaneously with the invasions of Alaric, the Hunns committed dreadful ravages in the *eastern* provinces, laying waste Moesia and Thrace, and penetrating as far as Antioch. And then, when Attila and his brother Bleda commenced their assaults on the empire, it was not against the western but against the eastern portion that they directed their efforts. The important towns of Viminacium, Retiarium, Singidunum, Naissus, and Sirmium, all in Moesia, Illyricum, or Thrace, are mentioned as having been captured, and the Emperor was so terrified at the progress of the brothers, that he left Constantinople and withdrew for a time into Asia. When the Hunns at last invaded the western empire, they did indeed pour their forces into Gaul by the valley of the Rhine, the only path which lay open for an invader from that quarter, destroying the towns on the banks of that river; but so far from confining themselves to that region, the cities of Arras, Besançon, Toul, Langres, and Orleans, were taken by them. Thus, even on Mr. Elliott's own showing, not the *third* part of the rivers, but at least two-thirds, namely, the whole course of the Danube, the Rhine, the Po, and its tributary streams, were ravaged by Attila. And moreover, the same regions must often have been devastated during the periods of the other trumpets. Never was there a barbarian host that burst upon the central or the eastern empire, that did not ravage the valley of the Danube. Nor ever did an enemy invade Gaul or Italy from the north without devastating the banks of the Rhine, or the river district of the Po and Adige. Take, for example, the expedition of Alaric the Goth, in 402, which falls under Mr. Elliott's first trumpet. He crossed the Julian Alps, besieged Aquileia, conquered Venetia, crossed the Adige, the Mincius, the Oglio, the Addua, and the Po; overran Liguria, and was defeated by Stilicho, and forced to retreat from Italy, at Pollentia, about twenty-five miles south-east of Turin. Take the incursion of Rhadagisus, three years afterwards, when he crossed (according to Gibbon) the Alps, the Po, and the Apennines, destroyed and pillaged many cities, and ended his hostile course at Florence. And as for the frontier of the Rhine, take from Gibbon's narrative a few pages further on, the following account of the invasion of Gaul by the Vandals and other German tribes in 406,

* Univ. Hist., vol. xvii. p. 243.

Digitized by Google

which might almost be taken for a narrative of Attila's march:—

"The banks of the Rhine were crowned, like those of the Tiber, with elegant houses, and well-cultivated farms; and if a poet descended the river, he might express his doubt on which side was situated the territory of the Romans. This scene of peace and plenty was suddenly changed into a desert, and the prospect of the smoking ruins could alone distinguish the solitude of nature from the desolation of man. The flourishing city of Mentz was surprised and destroyed, and many thousand Christians were inhumanly massacred in the church. Worms perished, after a long and obstinate siege. Strasburg, Spires, Rheims, Tournay, Arras, Amiens, experienced the cruel oppression of the German yoke; and the consuming flames of war spread from the banks of the Rhine over the greatest part of the seventeen provinces of Gaul."

It must surely be admitted that the geographical distinctions, on which Mr. Elliott relies, do not afford any very sufficient test to direct our application of the trumpets to the several Gothic invasions. And when we add, what has been already referred to, that the third part of the earth, which, in the first four trumpets, means the *western* portion of the empire, must, in the sixth, be transferred to the eastern, we think we have made out a very fair claim for the superiority of Mr. Birks's theory of interpretation.

It only remains to say a few words on the relation between the trumpets and the seals, for the interpretation of the one of these series necessarily affects that of the other. Mr. Birks has not given us any direct account of his views on this subject, but from some hints which he has dropped, we are led to think that he is inclined to adopt a system somewhat resembling that of Dr. Keith. Our view differs from both Dr. Keith's and Mr. Elliott's, and we venture to think will, if it be correct, strongly support Mr. Birks's theory of the trumpets. Of course, we cannot do more than present a very general outline of our system. We conceive that the fifth seal commences with the Christianization of the empire under Constantine, and runs on till the slaying of the witnesses; the details of this period being filled up in the subsequent visions. The earthquake of the sixth seal is, in our opinion, identical with the earthquake of the sixth trumpet; and the seventh seal and seventh trumpet are synchronous.

Thus, the first four seals trace the history of the empire till about the time of the removal of the seat of Government to Constantinople. The trumpets narrate the fall of the eastern Roman empire, and subsequently of the Byzantine empire by the hand of the Turks. The history of the western empire is resumed in the visions of the dragon and

Digitized by Google

of the two beasts. We have there presented to us the overthrow of Paganism, the breaking up of the empire into independent kingdoms; the rise of the Papacy and of the final Antichrist. And at this point the story of the slaying of the witnesses, and of the subsequent earthquake, brings together again the several series of visions.

We hope that Mr. Birks will favour us with some farther expositions of the Apocalypse, for it is impossible, as he himself remarks, for any exposition of a detached portion of it to be completely satisfactory; and he owes it to himself to work out his plan to its utmost extent.

Notes on Scripture.

Genesis ix. 11.

"And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud."

The dealings of God with Noah should be diligently studied, and the declarations of God to him reverently listened to. They both reveal God as almighty to deliver, and as delighting to hold communion with those whom he saves. He shuts Noah in the ark—guides him over a shoreless sea—tells him when to leave his asylum—meets him at the altar which he reared—makes known his gracious purpose—enters into a covenant with him—and hangs out in the heavens a perpetual token of its stability.

The words before us are full of *instruction* and *consolation ;* let us seek grace to understand their meaning, and to exercise faith and hope upon Him who uttered them. The frequent reference which the sacred Scriptures make to this law, and to the covenant of which it is the token, warrant our applying this passage to spiritual blessings and coming glories.

The objects pointed out before us are full of interest and wonder. "The *earth*,"—"the *cloud*,"—"the *bow*." The dwelling-place of sin—the depositories of vengeance—the declarations of mercy. How wonderful to find these in connexion with each other!

Look at the earth *physically ;* its magnitude, its contents, its productions, and the changes through which it has passed. Consider it

Digitized by Google

morally;—the people who have dwelt on it, and their history;—the scenes which have been enacted on its surface, and the manifestations of God therein. View it *prophetically*, and how glorious does it appear! It shall yet be clothed with beauty, and filled with a teeming population in whose hearts God's law shall be written, and his image impressed. The glory of God shall cover it, the curse shall be banished from it, the New Jerusalem shall adorn it with heavenly light and beauty, and there shall be no more death, no more pain. But it is not so yet; the earth *we* have to do with is the dwelling-place of sin. Clouds, dark and heavy-laden with storms, hang over it; clouds where the hailstones are treasured up, where the arrowy lightning dwells, and whence come the dread thunderbolts of Jehovah's vengeance. (Job xxxviii. 22, 23.) Once from these clouds the streaming waters were poured forth until the earth was deluged, and the highest mountains covered. Once from the bosom of a dark cloud the fiery shower fell, and overwhelmed five fair cities; and often since then have they poured their contents upon the earth in such abundance, that the trembling inhabitants have feared another deluge; but then a faithful God has caused the *bow* to be seen in the cloud.

How beautiful is that bow in itself, how instructive as a token! That bow is lovely as seen in the heavens above us; but it is much more beautiful as seen in the hemisphere of truth. How does the heart rejoice as it listens to the strains of Isaiah, "For this is as the waters of Noah unto me: for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth; so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee." (Isa. liv. 9.) How is the mind filled with wonder as it gazes upon the sublime vision which Ezekiel saw, beholds the awful manifestation all instinct with life, wheel within wheel, and rings towering high in dreadful majesty. But above the whole of this celestial mechanism, presiding over the mystic and multiform shapes, the flashing lightnings, the burning coals, the brilliant amber, the dreadful rings, the mysterious wheels, sat One enthroned in tranquil majesty, in the appearance of a man; and round the whole was thrown a splendid arch, "as the appearance of a bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about." (Ezek. i. 28.)

By studying this great vision in the light of Rev. iv. 5, we may perhaps learn something concerning the dignity of glorified saints, as derived from the exaltation of the God-man Christ Jesus, who is head over all things to his Church, and as connected with that covenant of peace, made with him and sealed with his blood, of which covenant of peace the bow is the token. The Apocalyptic seer tells us, that round about the throne was a rainbow in sight like unto an emerald (Rev. iv. 3), that beauteous colour wherewith God hath clothed the mountains and valleys of our earth.

Blessed token of *peace* to all who trust the sacrifice of Jesus! Blessed token of *promise* that our fallen world shall again be clothed with unfading beauty and loveliness! He that sitteth upon the throne,

Digitized by Google

for whose pleasure all things were created, looks upon that bow which surrounds his throne, and then, looking upon Jesus at his right hand, saith, "He shall not fail nor be discouraged, until he has set judgment in the earth, and the isles shall wait for his law."

But may not we poor dwellers on a groaning earth, oftentimes overhung with clouds of sorrow and mystery, desire some *consolation* now from this gracious declaration, "the bow shall be seen in the cloud." Surely it teaches us, *that however dark the dispensation is that hangs over us, there is security and comfort in God's covenant.* Dispensations may be dark, very dark; but God's covenant is bright, ever bright. It is unaltered by earth's changes and sorrows; it is divinely suited to comfort and cheer God's people, whatever are their circumstances. If terrible judgments shake the earth, if angry nations rage like the tumultuous ocean; if the earth is removed, and the mountains carried into the midst of the sea, he need not fear whose refuge is the Lord of Hosts, whose strength is the covenant God. If personal or relative trouble come upon a child of God, if comforts die, if friends forsake, he faints not, "for the secret of the Lord is with him, and Jehovah shows unto him his covenant," but sings with royal David, "This covenant, ordered in all things and sure, is all my salvation and all my desire." Yes, here is *security*, for Jehovah saith, "I will be thy God." Here is *consolation*, for this everlasting covenant contains the sure mercies of David. Believer, think what the covenant *contains* for you, and what it *ensures* to you, and consider that dark and trying dispensations are intended to endear this covenant, and to draw out its blessings into your bosom. If the heavens were always cloudless we could never see the bow. If your path were all pleasant you would not have such experience of the preciousness of the promises, nor such abundant proof that Jehovah your God kept the covenant of mercy to those that love him. Bless his name, then, who takes occasion from your trials, losses, and temptations, to bring out his stores of grace, and thus constrains you to say, "how great is his goodness, and how great is his beauty."

If we would realize the safety and blessedness contained in the covenant, we must look at the token which God has given. The bow in the cloud was a token to Noah that God would no more drown the world, and to it many eyes and thoughts have been directed, when the heavens have gathered blackness. The blood on the lintel and door-posts was the token to Israel that God would smite Egypt, but spare and deliver them. The scarlet thread was a token to Rahab that her life and the lives of her kindred should be spared; and, no doubt, wherever these tokens were looked at, faith was strengthened and hope revived. The blood of Christ, by which the covenant of grace was sealed, and all its promises and blessings made sure to every sinner who believeth, *is a token.* Think much of that blood, believer; have to do with it continually by faith, and you will enjoy all the blessings of the covenant. Consider its *worth* and efficacy; ever study it in connexion with the infinite person of Him who shed it. Think much

Digitized by Google

on its acceptableness to God, as evidenced by its being presented before his throne, and by the testimonies he has borne concerning it. Think of the warrant God gives you to make use of it, and be not satisfied without having it in your conscience speaking peace, and feeling it in your heart producing love. Have to do with it continually, every day, and all the day, so shall the blessings of the covenant come streaming into your hearts. Receiving the atonement, you shall have joy in God through Jesus Christ; "the God of hope will fill you with all joy and peace in believing;" "you shall rejoice in hope of the glory of God,"—yea, "glory in the midst of tribulations," for the "peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your heart and mind through Jesus Christ." Nor is this all: we shall not only be blessed, but God will be glorified. It cannot be too much thought upon, *that God is highly honoured when we look upon the token which he has given, and expect him to act according to the covenant which he has made.* He gave Noah the bow on purpose that he and all succeeding generations might look upon it, and expect him to act according to his promise. If any one, however abundant the rain—however dark the heavens—however unlikely it was that the appointed weeks of harvest would come, still believed that all would be even as God had promised, he was honoured by such confidence, and dishonoured when suspicions were entertained. In like manner he has given believers Christ's blood as a token that he will ever act in character as a covenant God and Father; and he is well pleased and greatly glorified when believing sinners rest simply on Jesus, and expect God to avert from them all they deserve, and bestow on them all that he has promised for the sake of his beloved One. "He will ever be mindful of his covenant" (Ps. cxi. 5); and his counsel to his children is, "Be ye ever mindful of his covenant." (1 Chron. xvi. 15.) The Apostle Paul presents us with a noble pattern in this respect, and is a proof of the advantages which result from thus acting. Let us survey his conduct, and seek grace to imitate him. Behold him, gazing believingly on the token of the covenant: "He spared not his own Son, but freely gave him up for us all;" and then, looking out hopefully for the blessing of the covenant, "He who did this, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" Still, as he gazed, his hope grew stronger, his love towards a covenant God, even the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, glowed with deeper rapture, and his anthem of joy rose in clearer, higher, more melodious tones, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. If God be for us, who can be against us?" While he thus sung, all was dark to the eye of sense; he was rocked on the billow and drenched by the storm. He seemed to be a mark for the hurricane's fury to expend itself upon. "Tribulation, distress, famine, nakedness, peril, sword," were the elements of that storm; but it mattered not to him, "the bow was in the cloud." He saw it, he understood its language, he believed its testimony, his mind was stayed on God, and he was kept in perfect peace. High above the

Digitized by Google

roaring of the tempest, hark! his glorious anthem peals: "I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Believer! gaze thou ever on thy crucified Saviour, and look for thy glorified Lord.

A day is coming, and it hastens greatly—a day of darkness and gloominess, of which the deluge was but a type, when a cloud shall come over the earth, in which there shall be no inverted, stringless bow, but one of a very different character. "God judgeth the righteous, and God is angry with the wicked every day. If he turn not, he will whet his sword; he hath bent his bow, and made it ready." (Ps. vii. 11, 12.) From the bosom of that dark and terrible cloud, "upon the wicked he will rain snares, fire and brimstone, and a horrible tempest." (Ps. xi. 6.) Then shall the value of that covenant of mercy which they have slighted and despised be seen. Then shall the decree go forth, "Gather my saints together unto me, those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." (Ps. l. 6.) And all who have looked upon the token of the covenant in faith, and who have observed with all their hearts its blessings, shall "enter into the joy of their Lord." And then another gathering will take place: "the tares will be gathered together in bundles to be burned;" and who shall deliver out of the hand of a righteous and almighty God? Oh, sinner! while judgment lingers—while the bow of mercy is stretched out in the heaven of truth—while God pleadeth with thee and beseecheth thee to be reconciled, "Take thou hold upon his covenant." To thee God speaketh: "Now consider this, ye that forget God, lest I tear you in pieces, and there be none to deliver." If terror cannot melt, may mercy win thy heart; for verily "unto you is the word of this salvation sent."

Alas! how few will heed this warning, or obey this invitation! "As it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man." Then a deluge of fire shall perform its purifying work—a new heaven and new earth shall arise wherein dwelleth righteousness—the antitypical Noah and his family shall take possession thereof, and pure worship shall everywhere be offered before that throne, "round which is a rainbow, in sight like unto an emerald;" and God "shall smell a sweet savour," and his tabernacle shall be with men, and he will dwell among them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." (Rev. xxi. 1—3.) Thus every promise shall be fulfilled, every pledge redeemed, and every desire satisfied.

Digitized by Google

Acts xv. 14—17.

"Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things."

The quotation here made from the prophet Amos by the Apostle James has been supposed to support a typical interpretation of the restoration of Israel, as though that event was to be understood only of the gathering in of the Christian Church, and we propose to examine it with the view of showing that the apostle's argument does not lead to any such conclusion.

The quotation is made from the Septuagint, and agrees with it very exactly in the latter portion, where both differ from the Hebrew. It is this difference which first requires our attention. The Hebrew runs thus:—

לְמַעַן יִירְשׁוּ אֶת שְׁאֵרִית אֱדוֹם וְכָל הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר נִקְרָא שְׁמִי עֲלֵיהֶם

rendered, in our authorized version, "that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen which are called by my name," and by the apostle: *Ὁπως ἀν ἐκζητησωσιν ὁι καταλοιποι των ἀνθρωπων τον Κυριον, και παντα τα ἐθνα ἐφ᾽ὁυς ἐπικεκληται το ὀνομα μου ἐπ᾽ ἀυτους.* Various modes of reconciling the discrepancy have been proposed. It has been suggested that the Hebrew text has been corrupted, and that in the days of the Septuagint translators it stood thus:—

לְמַעַן יִדְרְשׁוּ שְׁאֵרִית אָדָם אֶת יְהוָֹה

But it seems to be very unlikely that *adam* (men) should be the true reading instead of Edom, since the previous part of the prophecy is directed against the nations around the coasts of Israel, and Edom among the rest (chap. ii. 11, 12), and moreover, the parallel passage in Obadiah (ver. 18, 19) makes special mention of Esau or Edom. The same comparison of parallel passages pleads strongly in favour of יירשו, for we find that in these Israel is, in like manner, represented as the future possessor of the neighbouring hostile nations. Nor is there any trace, so far as we are aware, of a various reading in the Hebrew text. If, then, we may count upon its integrity in its present form, we may account for the reading of the Septuagint by supposing, first, that they mistook the Hebrew words that were before them; or, secondly, that they were merely translating *ad sensum*. Those who support the latter opinion contend that יירשו את שארית may be rendered, "the remnant shall possess, taking את for the sign of the nominative instead of the accusative. Thus Storr interprets, giving as his reason that otherwise we cannot easily explain to whom the plural verb applies, and especially that it was not the design of the prophet to threaten the nations who professed the name of God, as he

Digitized by Google

would certainly have done if he had foretold they were to be driven out of their dwelling-places by the Jews. What appears conclusively to set aside this interpretation is, that in Obad. 19—21, it is declared, in a way which cannot be evaded, that they of the south (of Israel) shall possess the Mount of Esau, and saviours shall come up on Mount Sion to judge the Mount of Esau, and the kingdom shall be the Lord's. We are, therefore, driven to the conclusion, that the Septuagint translators did mistake, or, for some unknown reason, mistranslate the words of this clause, and that the apostle retained their version only because the meaning was not inconsistent with the last clause of the verse upon which his argument was mainly founded.

We shall therefore examine the passage as it stands in the book of Amos: "The tabernacle of David (סכה) that is fallen," is generally interpreted of the house of David, supposed to be called "a tabernacle," because of its low and fallen condition. But the word סכה is never used to express a dwelling in the general sense; and, besides, the contrast is evidently not between the present *hut* and ancient *palace*, but between the tabernacle, in its former glorious condition, and the same in its present fallen and ruinous state, for it is to be built again *as in the days of old.* Wherever the word is used in any other than its literal sense of booths or tents, the idea connected with it seems rather to have been of an elevated than of a mean character. Take, for example, Ps. xxxi. 20: "Thou shalt hide them in the secret of thy presence from the pride of man; thou shalt keep them secretly *in a pavilion.*" I think, therefore, that the allusion is probably to the safety experienced by Israel and by the other nations who were, in David's time, under the government of Sion, and that the promise in the text is probably no other than that recorded in Isa. iv. 5, 6: "And the Lord will create upon every dwelling-place of Mount Sion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night, for upon all the glory shall be a defence. And there shall a tabernacle (סכה) for a shadow in the day time from the heat, and for a place of refuge, and for a covert from storm and from rain." I should be rather inclined to render it "the pavilion of David." The Hebrew word is oftener used with a reference to the feast of tabernacles than for any other purpose, and probably there may be in this passage an allusion to the accomplishment of the event typified by that feast,—the day when the tabernacle of God shall be with man.

"And close up the breaches thereof, and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old." The fem. pl. affix of פרציהן appears to bear an allusion to the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel. At least, it is difficult to see any other antecedent. "I will heal the breaches of them," implies, therefore, that Judah and Ephraim shall be united, and the twelve tribes gathered, in the day when the tabernacle of David shall be set up.

"That they may possess the remnant of Edom." *They, i.e.,* those who are most interested in the tabernacle of David—the Jews. "The remnant of Edom;" those who had escaped from destruction. The phrase is not an uncommon one in the prophets with reference to that

Digitized by Google

day of vengeance with which the Lord will introduce his kingdom of glory. Thus Ezekiel, when speaking of the days of Israel's restoration, says, "The heathen *that are left* round about you shall know that I the Lord build the ruined places." (Ezek. xxxvi. 36.) And Zechariah: "Every one *that is left* of all the nations which came against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles." (Zech. xiv. 16.) Here, not only Edom, but many other nations, are mentioned, and their future obedience to Jehovah foretold. And just so, in our text, not only the remnant of Edom is spoken of, but "of *all* nations which are called by the name of the Lord." Nor does the *possession* of this remnant by the Jews imply that they shall be driven out from their dwellings, but that the impenitent among them having been visited with utter destruction, in inflicting which the people of God shall be employed as agents, those who have acknowledged him shall become subjects of the restored kingdom of David, which shall stretch the covering wings of its protection over many lands. "Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment; and a man shall be as an hiding-place from the wind and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land." (Isa. xxxii. 1, 2.) Perhaps Edom is mentioned by Amos before the other nations, to show that the tribes descended from Abraham shall have the pre-eminence over other peoples, and stand next in favour to restored Israel. At all events, that country is destined to bear an important part in the events which shall precede the millennium. It is from *Edom* that the Redeemer comes with dyed garments in the day of vengeance. (Isa. lxiii. 1.)

A few sentences will show the purpose for which the apostle quoted the prophecy. From it, as from many other passages, it was apparent that before the restoration of Israel, it was God's purpose to call an "election," or "remnant," out from among the Gentiles, who, after the day of wrath, should be partakers with Israel in the blessedness of the Messiah's kingdom. Founding his argument, therefore, not upon the fact that the tabernacle of David was to be built up, but upon the fact that before that time there should be among the Gentiles those who should be called by the name of the Lord, the apostle decides for the admission of Gentiles to the Christian Church, without requiring them first to become Jews. We must remember that the apostles, although aware of the future restoration of Israel and coming of the Lord, were in ignorance of the period when this great event was to be expected; and there are several passages in the New Testament which lead to the conclusion, that they had no grounds on which confidently to decide that he might not come even in their own lifetime.

Digitized by Google

REVELATIONS XVIII.

VERSE 1. In the last chapter the angel talked with John, and showed him by the Spirit the mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carried her; but this angel has a commission to call the whole earth to witness her fall and punishment. What manner of power belongs to this angel? The power of the Spirit, as we perceive by the next clause—"the earth was lightened with his glory," by which we are to understand that God revives his work by making manifest his judgments upon his enemies. So we read in Habak. iii. 3—6, "His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise;"—when? When "before him went the pestilence, and burning coals at his feet." So Isaiah vi. 3, the seraphim proclaim—"The whole earth is full of his glory;" when he appears in vision to his prophet, that he may give him his commission to proclaim the approaching desolation of the land.

2. This is a repetition of the proclamation of chap. xiv.—*Mightily* and with a *strong voice*. None shall be able to say, We have not heard, we have not known! Babylon's fall shall point her out to those who would not even to that day believe. Is Babylon then already fallen when this proclamation sounds forth? No! but at the point to fall, as is expressed by the 21st verse—*shall be thrown down*. And how often is similar phraseology used amongst men! This angel makes his annunciation "at the very smallest interval before the catastrophe, and with an effulgence of light and strength of voice correspondent with the urgency of the time; even as its last as well as loudest echo upon the ear of nations."—(Elliott). "And is become the habitations of devils," &c. A spiritual fall always precedes the day of utter destruction. Is there a spiritual fall then even in Babylon? There is: for every Church and nation doomed to fall, first fills up the measure of her iniquities. When the pride of Babylon's queenly power over the nations of Christendom had reached its culminating point, one of her own sons thus depicts her—"Tyrant of the soul and of the mind, she extinguishes the light of nature and feeling. A sacred respect guards her *mostly* from punishment, *always* from shame. What can the throne appear to *her*, who looks down upon it as it were from the height of heaven? People and kings, all are confounded in her sight, who distinguishes amongst men only her slaves and her victims. What an ENEMY, Sire, against kings—against the fathers of nations—such a monster who tears to pieces their children even within their arms, without their daring to resist!"—(Marmontel's Epistle to the King of Sweden.) Well might a subject of France thus speak—looking back upon the massacres of the Vaudois and of St. Bartholomew—the wars of the League—and more lately the work of the Jesuits in causing Louis XIV. to extinguish the Jansenists—to scatter and destroy the Protestants. Thus, "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus," could Heaven yet bear with her? Could the audacity of her iniquity mount yet nearer to

Digitized by Google

the majesty of the throne of God? Yes: this earth-born luminary was to appear under yet another phase. As the true Church rises brighter from the waters of affliction, the apostate one was to show *her* conditions aftër a similar submersion. She was to be brought under a series of trials that should sift out from her every grain of gold; she was to be "searched with candles," that *not one* might remain in her who had received the love of the truth. When Louis XVI. fell, there was a great struggle for *principles:* multitudes forsook their worldly possessions rather than render obedience to a Government, that had relieved itself of the most solemn obligations—human and Divine. For this cause princes and nobles fought and bled: and even of Romish ecclesiastics, thousands resisted to exile and to death rather than yield up their allegiance to the throne and altar. But how has Louis-Philippe fallen?—where now is the contest for principle—who has fled or fought—but for the saving of life and worldly possessions? Who can look on *this* picture and on *that,* and forbear to acknowledge how much lower in the scale of dignity and honour the Romish kingdoms have descended within the last fifty years? The late Monarch of France sat so near the earth, that his overturn was the appropriate task of the vilest of his people; he was, as it were, blown over by the breath of their mouths. And who were his counsellors, his comforters? Amongst them, one who had busied himself for years in obliterating the sanctions of religion and morality from the minds of the people,—a newspaper editor, M. Emile Girardin. But, indeed, what thoughtful mind does not see in Louis-Philippe a mere *locum tenens,* placed to fill up the room of a king till the time had come appointed by the Prince of kings, and His purposes had ripened for the breaking in pieces of that throne. No believer could look to behold a stable dynasty built upon such a foundation—a king by the *grace* of the *people.*

And what has been the part assumed by the Romish bishops in this new overturn of the monarchy? "Far from declaiming against the Republic, they lavish upon those who have brought it about the most fulsome adulation, and fervently implore the blessings of heaven upon the work of those ungodly men. So long as Louis-Philippe was upon the throne, they inclined themselves humbly before him. But he has fallen. Away, then, with this king, who can no longer grant either privileges or money."—(Letter from France in "Evangelical Christendom," 1848.)

3. "For, (or as we have it at xiv. 8), because all nations have drunk," &c. Here a judgment is pronounced upon her for her wide-reaching perversions. We may understand this verse as also intimating that her punishment is a consequent of the nation's drunkenness. "Babylon hath been a golden cup in the Lord's hand, that made all the earth drunken: the nations have drunken of her wine: therefore the nations are mad." (Jer. li. 7.)

What may the wine of Babylon's fornication be? Probably her false doctrine, refined to the utmost, so as to yield its essential strength; and *that is* Jesuitism. But how do the kings of the earth commit fornication with her? They receive from her dictation the forms of

Digitized by Google

an idolatrous worship, and by them it is recommended to their people; while it is enforced upon both by means of the "false prophet," or ecclesiastical body, who, with lying wonders and all the "deceivableness of unrighteousness," seduce and make captive the minds of men.

In another sense they commit fornication *with* her. The Church of Rome, by a natural transposition, has made herself that Intercessor, Mediator, and High Priest, whose honours she had already transferred from our Lord to his saints. For she herself appoints mediators by her canonizing of saints, and thus shows herself as God in the "temple of God," an idol, and a worshipper of idols. What other sin, then, are they guilty of but fornication, who seek *her* sanctions, whether for matters of Church or State?

But who are these merchants of the earth that are waxed rich through her? Is their merchandise spiritual or carnal? Being spoken of in immediate connexion with the "voice of her fornication," they can be no other than the factors of that "vine of the earth," mentioned at chap. xiv. 18, 19, which can typify nothing else than the *apostate Church.* "How art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine unto me!" (Jer. ii. 21.)

But what is the nature of these delicacies through which her merchants are waxed rich? The "gifts of God," which are *not* to be purchased with *money.* They traffic continually in pardons, indulgences, absolutions, and, lest these should not be enough, they add the inventions of Satan in commutation for all sorts of vows. Dispensations for the breach of their own laws and of the laws of God are huddled together in the same packet; only a higher price is marked upon the former than upon the latter.

And finally, as a living writer sets forth at large (who, dwelling in the cities of Babylon, has a certain knowledge of these things), "The Pope's blessing alone brings him back a vast revenue of gold and silver. How? The Pope blesses the cardinals, the cardinals the bishops, the bishops the priests; the priests then bless the chaplets, crosses, and medals; and thus the Papal blessing, divided and subdivided into numerous small brooks, spreads and penetrates into all the corners of the earth, being *articles* of *traffic.*" And, if there were nothing else, masses for the souls of the dead must bring an abundant revenue to the factors of the *degenerate vine;* for with them the *golden key* opens heaven itself.

4. "And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people." Is there, then, yet a people of God dwelling in the midst of the apostasy? There is: we are told by a living authority, "The Bible is in their hands; and many more, no doubt, than is known to human eyes have studied the sacred page with sincere devotion. Italians themselves testify that there are many of their priests who would gladly walk in the pure light of the Gospel, if it were possible, without sacrificing the very means of existence."—(Correspondent of "Evan. Christ.," 1848.) But they dare not—they dare not preach Jesus Christ and Him crucified as the ONE ONLY SAVIOUR of mankind;

Digitized by Google

instead of as the docile son of the *more* loving and *more* merciful Mary. Warnings similar to this in the text are given by the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah to the people of God—the years of their captivity being expired—that they should no longer linger in Babylon, for God was about to destroy that place. "My people, go ye out of the midst of her, and deliver ye every man his soul from the fierce anger of the Lord." (Jer. li. 45.) Then is it a coming forth from her cities that is enjoined on the people of God as concerning modern Babylon? Apparently not; except when it accords with the Gospel precept, "If ye be persecuted in one city, flee unto another." But as they abide in the mystic Babylon, so it is from her spiritual assemblies that they are to come out, according to 2 Cor. vi. 17: "Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you."

"Partakers of her sins." A separation in name and outward profession is not sufficient. Babylon's cup is sent round to all the nations; it is of a mingled quality, to suit all tastes, as has been well observed; "she is *superstitious* with the credulous, *artistical* with painters and poets, *aristocratic* with princes and nobles, and democratic with liberals. She assumes all masks, adopts all disguises, plays all parts." Nevertheless, all the marks of the apostasy remain upon her, and the peculiar character of God's people being that of *witnesses*, if we hold fellowship with the "unfruitful works of darkness," we cannot reprove them.

"Receive not of her plagues." Can it be, then, that without change of place, the Lord's witnesses shall be preserved from the judgments upon Babylon? Even this is possible to the Lord. "They shall not be ashamed in the evil time, and in the days of famine they shall be satisfied."

5. "For her sins have reached unto heaven." Was there not always in her the spirit of insubordination to the Word of God? True; but in other days she taught and observed (for the most part) submission to lawful authority, and honour to the "powers that be." But now, in hopes to maintain her own power over the people, she has yielded up even this last show of deference to the ordinance of God; and in so doing has sealed up her condemnation, and prepared the materials for her own destruction. "The present movement had its rise in Rome. It began with the spiritual head of the Roman apostasy, and with the federal head of what was at first the Roman empire, that is, the Pope."—(Letter from Naples, March, 1848.) France, indeed, is for the present the head and representative of the other Romish kingdoms. Her chariot drives furiously. To use a scriptural expression, she is the *breaker* that goes up before them. But do we not see how all the others are following in her wake,—how nearly all the Popish kingdoms have yielded up the principle of *conscience* towards God, in honouring kings as his vicegerents?

"God hath remembered her iniquities." He is the God of patience. He waiteth that he may be gracious. He is long-suffering, not willing that any should perish, but that he should return from his ways and

Digitized by Google

live. His will, as testified in all his actings towards man during the day of grace, is, that they should come unto the knowledge of the truth, and be saved. Upon this point he condescends even to reason with his people, as though they would think themselves unfairly treated by this long impunity granted to their oppressors: "But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness." (2 Pet. iii. 8, 9.) And of this characteristic his enemies are duly reminded, when at length he "goes forth as a mighty man, and stirs up jealousy as a man of war. I have long time holden my peace; I have been still, and refrained myself." (Isa. xlii. 13.) And: "These things hast thou done, and I kept silence; thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as thyself." (Ps. l. 21.)

At chap. xvi. 19, it was already announced: "Great Babylon came in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath." *The fierceness of his wrath.* Not to be tasted merely, or drank and put aside, but held to the lips, draught after draught; famines and pestilences and earthquakes; torment and sorrow and mourning and death; drained to the dregs and wrung out. "In the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the wine is red; it is full of mixture; and he poureth out of the same: but the dregs thereof, all the wicked of the earth shall wring them out, and drink them." (Ps. lxxv. 8.)

Was there ever such a day of wrath and tribulation?—the *strength* of the Lord put forth in judgment, even of Him who is mighty to save! and REMEMBRANCE is the altar on which this cup is prepared.

REV. XXII. 14.

It appears from the careful researches of Mr. S. P. Tregelles, in his most excellent edition of the "Book of Revelation," that the ancient and genuine reading of the first clause of this verse is somewhat different from our authorized editions. His edition is the fruit of labour bestowed on all the documents within his reach; *not a single word* in it but is guaranteed by manuscript authority of at least twelve hundred years old, and by far the greater number is vouched for by MSS. of fourteen hundred years old.

We may have occasion yet to advert to some of the true readings thus recovered to us, which in some cases cast a new shade of meaning on passages. But let us notice the one before us, as being remarkable and interesting, and as it is referred to by Mr. Tregelles himself, in the preface to his English "Translation of the Book of Revelation from the Ancient Greek Text."

The common reading in Rev. xxii. 14, is, "*Blessed are they who keep his commandments,*" "*οι ποιοῦντες τας ἐντολας αὐτου.*" The reading now ascertained as by far the best supported is, "*οἱ πλυνοντες τας στολας αὐτῶν*"—"BLESSED ARE THOSE WHO WASH THEIR ROBES,

Digitized by Google

that they may have a right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." On this, Mr. T. remarks, "The common text can be understood *by means of other Scriptures* in such a way as not to contradict *grace;* but a soul that values the salvation which God has provided in the blood of Christ, finds in the declaration, 'Blessed are those who wash their robes,' that on which it can repose, as having the Gospel of the *grace* of God in Christ's redemption brought before it with a rich unction. How beautifully have we thus the holiness of those gates of pearl, through which nothing that defileth shall ever enter, set in immediate connexion with that cleansing through which a title is given to enter in as ransomed, forgiven, and saved. Thoughts are presented to us of holiness, grace, and redemption, in the harmony in which it has pleased God to manifest them. We can contemplate the holiness of the heavenly city without one feeling which hinders the joy of the soul as trusting in Christ. The believer may now rejoice in saying, 'Worthy is the Lamb;' he may feel the worthiness of Jesus to be his title to enter in, even before the very throne of God, to be presented there in robes washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb. To me, it would be a reward for years of toil, to be the means of bringing one such text forward with the full light of clear and certain evidence bearing on it; and if, in a case like this, we *may feel* refreshment of spirit from a result of criticism, may we not pay all attention to such results with regard to other subjects in the Scripture, whether precepts or prophecies?"

Reviews.

Lectures on Subjects connected with Prophecy, &c. By the Rev. James Kelly, M.A. Third Edition. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1848.

Though differing very widely from Mr. Kelly on some points, we can still welcome very cordially this new edition of his Lectures. There is much valuable thought to be found in these pages, much opening-up of Scripture, and much fervour of spirit in the things of Christ. We take in good part the counsel he gives the Anti-futurists at pp. 225, 226; only we must say that we are not conscious of following the traditions of men, in our views of the Apocalypse, or of Antichrist. We trust that we are not following others headlong, and we cordially unite with Mr. Kelly in his prayer: "Oh, for more simplicity in the study of the Sacred Word!" Whilst appreciating much of the prophetical part of the work, we would also call the attention of our readers to the first two chapters, which are more theological than prophetical. They contain much important and striking truth,—truth

Digitized by Google

too much overlooked among us, yet most needful and profitable. We have enjoyed much this part of the volume in particular, and we are sure that a saint seeking to know more of God and of his mind, will find it very suitable and precious. We may further add, that the Lectures are, from first to last, most practical. The author loses no opportunity of turning the truth he handles into direct and warm appeals to the conscience of the reader.

Missions; an Essay. By the Rev. W. Mudge. London: J. Nisbet and Co.

Mr. Mudge places missions upon their true and scriptural basis, without, in the very least, disparaging them. Anti-millenarians are fond of accusing us of depreciating missions and missionary efforts; they would fain create a prejudice against us on this score. How utterly groundless the accusation is, any one may discover who will only read Millenarian works upon the subject, or mark the practice of Millenarians. Mr. Mudge's excellent work may help to remove the false impression, while it states the real views of Millenarians.

The Harmony of History with Prophecy; an Exposition of the Apocalypse. By Josiah Conder. London: J. F. Shaw. 1849.

We are indebted to Mr. Conder for much valuable information, and some useful hints; for his work is one of research, ability, and candour; but from many of his views we dissent. Where there are so many points on which we differ, it is not easy to criticize without a much more elaborate and lengthened review than we can afford to give.

The Retrospect: being an Inquiry into the Fulfilment of Prophecy during the last Twenty Years, &c. Vol. II. London: Painter. 1847.

We fear that the extravagant views set forth in various parts of this volume, as well as in its predecessor, will repel many an inquiring mind from the subject. It is most deeply to be mourned, that rash and unadvised thoughts should be given to the Church upon points on which Scripture, to say the least, has given us but little light. Hints and suggestions one can always welcome; but statements, lengthened and reiterated, upon points of no small difficulty, and on which our light is but scanty, are only fitted to deter from study. That there are many most valuable truths brought out in this volume, we do not deny,—that a student of prophecy will be able to glean many precious things from it, we may safely affirm; but this does not hinder us from wishing that there had been more of sober-mindedness and less of rashness in it,—more of real scriptural truth and less of *unproved* opinion.

Digitized by Google

The Mountains of the Bible; their Scenes and their Lessons. By the Rev. JOHN MACFARLANE, LL.D., Glasgow. London: James Nisbet and Co. 1849.

THE engravings in this volume, of which there are four, are beautifully executed, and help to draw attention to the contents. Occasionally, too, there are solid observations, as well as sound truths, stated in connexion with the "mountains of the Bible;" *e.g.*, that mighty things have been done, not by masses of men, but by solitary men. "Noah, Abraham, Moses, Aaron, David, Elijah, stand out conspicuously as illustrative of this great principle in Christian ethics, that *every man*, in his own place and generation, is bound to be a witness for the Lord." But, on the other hand, the statements are occasionally not accurate, *e.g.*, when we are told of Carmel's having "a *thousand* caves or grottoes," and that "Elijah and Elisha often resorted to them;" (pp. 240-1): or when Elijah is spoken of as "the good old seer of *Judah*" (p. 247); the valley of *Elath* is connected with Mount *Gilboa* (p. 203); and when it is said (p. 350) "of the literal Mount Zion, there are now no remains!"

There is much that is pleasing in the book, but the descriptions of scenes and places are often laboured. The writer has omitted every reference to the *prophetic associations*, even of such hills as Olivet and the Transfiguration-hill. He is too much fascinated with surface appearances when he speaks of "a reviving Church, such as the Church of Christ is at present!" He does not see that even the wise virgins slumber and sleep. Many a student of the Bible would have found ample room to view the coming glory from some of these "mountains;" but the only reference to prophecy in this volume, is p. 350, in a most undervaluing remark regarding the restoration of Jerusalem: "And it is of greater importance to hasten on the period when the earth shall be filled with his knowledge, than to define the seasons of any particular people's advancement from unbelief to Christ, from the world to the Church." What does this mean? Are we to refuse to consult God's chart of the future? And would this not aid us in occupying our talents to greater advantage till the Lord come? "To the word and to the testimony." (2 Peter i. 19.)

The Christian Indeed: or, the Lord's Prayer expounded. By the Rev. WILLIAM TAIT, Wakefield. London: Seeleys. 1849.

MR. TAIT is already known in the Churches by his "Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews," a work of great excellence and practical utility. The present is a smaller one, but with all the excellences of the former. This exposition of the Lord's Prayer is minute and full, and will be found most helpful in guiding one's meditations over the different petitions. We might have desired a fuller interpretation of the KINGDOM, and the things pertaining to it; at the same time, every writer has his own plan, and his own way, of developing his thoughts. The spirit and tone of the whole are elevated, and the style itself

Digitized by Google

vigorous and distinct. Were it not for overstretching our limits, we should like to have given a few extracts. But our readers must rest satisfied with a simple recommendation.

The Rise and Fall of the Papacy. By the Rev. ROBERT FLEMING, Jun., Minister of the Gospel, London. Reprinted without abridgment from the edition of 1701. Edited, with a Memoir of the Author, by the Rev. THOMAS THOMSON. John Johnstone, London and Edinburgh.

SEVERAL reprints have lately been published of this remarkable little work, in consequence of its being supposed to contain a prediction of the events of the last year upon the Continent. Immediately after the French Revolution of 1792, a similar interest in it was excited by the fact that the author had fixed upon the year 1794 as the date of a great judgment upon the French empire. The *double* coincidence is certainly very striking, and merits investigation, even though it should prove to be only accidental. The work consists of a short but very able outline of a commentary on the Apocalypse, fully entitled to take its place with the schemes of Mede and Cressener; but it is over estimated when, on account of the supposed test to which it has been put, it is held up as essentially correct in its main principles of interpretation. On the other hand, some silly attempts have been made to depreciate the author, which have issued only in proving the ignorance of the writers of them. Fleming was a man in high repute in his own day. He was brought from the charge of the English Presbyterian Church at Rotterdam, to be minister of the Scottish congregation at Founders' Hall, Lothbury, at the desire, it is said, of King William III., who had become acquainted with his talents and learning while in Holland, and whose friendship he continued to experience till his death in 1716.

The work itself is now so easy of access that we shall not give any outline of its contents, farther than may be necessary for our immediate purpose of inquiring into the principle upon which the author selected the years 1794 and 1848, as the dates of two European revolutions. In some of its leading points, his interpretation agrees very remarkably with that of Mr. Elliott. Thus, the sixth seal is expounded of the times of Constantine. The fifth and sixth trumpets of the Saracens and Turks; the slaying of witnesses (exactly as in the "Horæ") of the three years and a half preceding Luther. With this date, Fleming commences the pouring out of the vials, interpreting them as judgments upon the Papacy, and accessions of strength to the Protestant interest. The first vial is the preaching of the Reformers, A.D. 1516—66. The second, the wars between Spain and the Netherlands, from 1566 to 1617. The third, the wars in Germany, from 1617 to 1648, when they were terminated by the peace of Munster. The fourth, the French hostilities and wars in Flanders, beginning about the year 1648. This vial, the effect of which was to humble

Digitized by Google

the Austrian power by means of France, Fleming considered as still running on at the time when he wrote (1701), as likely to come to its highest pitch in 1717, and to run out in 1794. Then the fifth vial was to commence, and to terminate about the year 1848; and the sixth and seventh to occupy the space of time between 1848 and 2000, when Rome Papal shall be finally destroyed. The several points of time, then, fixed upon by Fleming, and which were still future when he wrote, are 1717 (the very year after his own death), 1794, 1848, and 2000, and our intention is to inquire into the principle upon which these epochs have been selected.

We may observe, however, at the outset, that of the three years which are now among the past, one has not answered the expectations of our author. Nothing occurred in 1717 to mark that year as the acmé of the fourth vial, and it is vain, therefore, with such an error before us, to contend that Fleming's system is correct in its principles. Still, two of the three years which he pointed out have been signalized by such events as he seems to have anticipated, and an occurrence so remarkable deserves inquiry.

The process by which he attained to his conclusions was the following: Having, upon grounds which we shall examine by and by, determined that 1260 apocalyptic days are equal to 1242 Julian years, he fixes on the years A.D. 475, A.D. 552, A.D. 606, and A.D. 758, as four great steps in the rise of the Papacy, and numbering 1242 years from each of these dates, we are brought to the years 1717, 1794, 1848, and 2000, which Fleming has accordingly fixed upon as leading epochs in the course of the several vials. What has rendered the theory very specious is, that, as the terminating points were all future in the days of the author, it has been supposed that he could not have any bias in favour of any particular adjustment, but that he selected his epochs of commencement, and adopted his method of reckoning upon principles wholly independent of the conclusions in which they resulted. It seems, however, very certain that this supposition is not correct. Fleming must have had other reasons for fixing on these years, besides their being, each of them, the terminating point of the great apocalyptic period; for otherwise he would scarcely have introduced, and so strongly contended for, a mode of reckoning, new in his day, which shortens that period by eighteen years. It would have been perfectly the same to him to have taken 1260 years as his measure, and to have fixed on 1735 instead of 1717, 1812 instead of 1794, 1866 instead of 1848, and 2018 instead of 2000. Indeed, he has himself informed us, in regard to two of his dates, that he had another reason for fixing on these precise years.

After naming the year A.D. 2000 as the consummating era, he says:—

"And if what I suggested above be true,—that Antichrist shall not be finally destroyed until the coming of Christ, then may this calculation be looked upon as very considerable. For it has been a very ancient opinion that the world would last only 6000 years; that, according to the old traditional prophecy of the house of Elias, the world should stand as many millenaries as it was made

Digitized by Google

in days, and that, therefore, as there were 2000 years from the creation to Abraham, without a written directory of religion, and 2000 from thence to Christ, under the old economy of the law, so there would be 2000 years more under the Messiah, so that, after the militant state of the Christian Church is run out in the year 2000, it is to enter upon the glorious sabbatical millenary."—P. 40.

And then, again, he gives as his reason for fixing on the year A.D. 1717, not merely that it is 1242 years from A.D. 475, but also,—

"Because this year leads us down to a new centenary revolution; for, is it not observable that John Huss and Jerome of Prague (to run this up no farther) were burned in the year 1417? After which the true religion in Bohemia and other places was more and more obscured until that famous year, 1517, when Luther arose and gave the Reformation a new character, according to that remarkable prediction of Jerome of Prague, *Centum annis revolutis Deo respondebitis et mihi.* . . . From which year the reformed interest did still increase till the year 1617, about which time the German and Bohemian wars began to break out. . . . So that there is ground to hope that about the beginning of another such century things may again alter for the better."—P. 64.

Nor can we avoid noticing that the same principle of *centenary revolutions* may have had some influence, although Fleming does not notice it, in giving to the year 1848 its place in his scheme. For the year 1648 being the end of the third, and beginning of the fourth vial, the interval between the dates is *two* centuries, and, doubtless, if our author could have found any prophetical reason for bisecting this interval, he would have noticed the coincidence. We could now-a-days, by the light of the past, assist this portion of his theory, for, in the year 1748, the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle was signed, which secured the succession of Maria Theresa, an event of the utmost importance in the history of Europe.

Let us try, then, and trace the successive steps by which the scheme was formed. The year 2000 was, in all probability, the point from which Fleming started. He had *à priori* reasons for supposing it to be the *last* date in the prophetic calendar; but, on measuring back 1260 years, he would find himself carried to an earlier period than Pepin's gift to the Pope, the last step in the exaltation of the Papacy. This would lead to an attempt to shorten the interval, and having discovered a principle upon which the 1260 years might be reckoned as 1242, he would commence the period in A.D. 758, in order that it might terminate in A.D. 2000. And that this was indeed the process by which the conclusion was reached, appears to be confirmed by the fact that A.D. 758 is not the usual date assigned to Pepin's grant. Bishop Newton fixes that event, according to Sigonius, in the year 755; and the authors of the "Universal History" give the same date. Nor does Fleming assert positively that 758 is the true date, but merely that, as nearly as he can trace, the donation was given in or about that year—about the time that Pope Paul I. began to build the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul. A second terminating date had, as we have seen, been fixed on *à priori* considerations, to the year 1717, and it would confirm our author in the correctness of his reckoning, when he found that 1242 years, counted back from 1717, led to A.D. 475, the year of the fall of the western Roman empire.

Digitized by Google

There remained two dates from which the *commencement* of the great apocalyptic period might be reckoned. The one of these, A.D. 606, had been already fixed upon by others, and still holds its place among more recent commentators. A period of 1242 years, reckoned from it, runs out in 1848, and thus the year appears in his system. The other date, the fall of the Ostro-Gothic empire, A.D. 552, had been already assigned by him as the close of the third trumpet, and counting 1242 years from it, he arrives at the year 1794, or, rather, at the year 1795, for 553 is the true commencing date, as given in the earlier part of his work.

Enough has now been said, we think, to show that the fixing on the two dates, 1794 and 1848, cannot be looked upon in any other light than a fortunate coincidence. Both of them rest on the supposition that the mode of reckoning the 1242 years is correct (and we shall point out by and by some objections to this supposition), and that the dates of departure are of such a character as to warrant their being assumed as epochs of commencement. The year 606 is of such a character; but no one will, we think, maintain the same of the year 553, which, according to Fleming himself, did not mark any accession to the power of the Papacy, but only an event which enabled the Pope some time afterwards gradually to assume temporal power. Besides, 1795 is not the precise date which we should have looked for as that on which a blow was to be given to the French monarchy. It should have been three years earlier, and, if Fleming's principles were correct, they should have brought out an *exact* result.

Such coincidences are apt to make a far deeper impression than they ought; and perhaps we can best show how little dependance can be placed on them by submitting another instance of coincidence as striking, formed upon different data. In 480, the Gothic kingdom, which succeeded the Western Empire, was fully established by treaties with the Eastern Empire and the other barbaric sovereigns. In 533 came forth Justinian's decretal epistle to the Pope. In 588, the conquests of the Lombards completely disorganized the Roman government in Rome, allowing the Pope to assume temporal authority in that city. In 606, Phocus gave him the title of Universal Bishop. Count 1260 years from each of these dates, and they will terminate on the years 1740, 1793, 1848, and 1866. The *first* is the year when Frederic the Great of Prussia commenced the war of the Austrian succession, the first great blow dealt to the German empire. "The moment," he says, in a letter to Algarotti, dated October 28th, 1740, "is arrived for an entire change of political system. The stone is launched which will fall on Nebuchadnezzar's image, and dash it in pieces." The *second* is the date of the French Revolution. The *third* is the present year; and the fourth is still in the womb of futurity. We build nothing on these coincidences; we merely notice them to show how easily many such schemes might be framed.

But we must say something, in conclusion upon the process by which the 1260 days of the Apocalypse are, by Fleming, made to represent 1242 years. His argument is, that, since a prophetical year contains

Digitized by Google

twelve months of thirty days each, or 360 days, therefore the year which each of these days denotes must likewise be a year of 360, and not of 365 days. Here there is a *non sequitur*, for, although it is true that a prophetical year or *time* contains 360 days, a measure probably adopted because of the facility of division it affords, there is no reason to conclude that when the days are to be turned into years, these years should be any other than the ordinary civil year in use when the prophet wrote, that is, a year of 365 days, and something more. Fleming applies his calculation also to the weeks of Daniel, suggesting, that, instead of the seventy weeks being 490 years, they are to be reckoned as 483, or 490 years of 360 days each. Now, this affords a means of at once refuting the theory; for we know exactly how much a Jewish week of years was, namely, seven *solar* years, for, by a very simple device, the Jewish year always corresponded with the course of the sun. A month was intercalated whenever the Passover would otherwise have fallen too soon to enable them to commence the barley harvest immediately after the feast. But if seventy weeks of years only amounted to 483 solar years, then must the season have in turn coincided with every month of the Jewish year, which is absurd. We have, therefore, the strongest possible reason for concluding that whenever a day stands for a year, it stands for a civil year of 365 days.

The Harmony of the Apocalypse with other Prophecies of Holy Scripture. With Notes, &c. By the Rev. W. H. Hoare, M.A. London: Parker. 1848.

In the commencement of his Preface, the author states that his object in this work is to exhibit the close analogy between this and other prophecies of Holy Scripture in a form adapted for general reading, as well as to digest and harmonize, in some degree, what has been advanced by commentators in elucidation of this remarkable book. The author, though not a Millenarian, is calm and candid. The reader will find useful information both in the Notes and in the Appendix. The book is handsomely printed, and pleasant to read.

Lectures on the Apocalypse, Critical, Expository, and Practical, delivered before the University of Cambridge; being the Hulsean Lectures for the Year 1848. By Christopher Wordsworth, D.D. London: Rivingtons. 1849.

That these Lectures contain research and valuable information, we willingly allow. Thus far we are indebted to them, but no farther. They are intensely Anti-millenarian, setting aside the first resurrection, and treating the whole doctrine of the Millennium as a mere fable. They are also more than sufficiently *High Church*,—exalting baptism, and ascribing all Millenarianism to "low and inadequate views of our baptismal privileges and obligations."—P. 57.

Digitized by Google

The Midnight Cry; or, the Coming of the Son of Man considered. By the Rev. JOSEPH BURCHELL. Edinburgh: W. P. Kennedy. 1849.

IT is somewhat difficult to know what this author's opinions are. He has some peculiar theory of his own, which appears to us far from scriptural; he makes the Millennium after the Advent, but it is a Millennium entirely of the risen saints; he differs from Anti-millenarians, but he differs more from Millenarians; at the same time, he is so mystical and circuitous in his statements, that we have great difficulty in understanding his meaning. He seems to think that the hosts of Gog and Magog are armies of devils, not of men. Several strange notions may be discerned in different parts of the volume. This grieves us. Though Mr. Burchell has much more in common with Anti-millenarians than with us, still we grieve that there should be such a putting forth of hasty thoughts upon prophetic subjects. We do not wish to arrest prophetic inquiry, nor to stereotype the amount of prophetic truth already received; but we desire to protest most earnestly and solemnly against the putting forth of rash views. This is a sore evil; and it is an evil which we are resolved, in the strength of God, unceasingly and unsparingly to condemn. Nothing has so injured and discredited prophetic truth as crude speculations; and as witnesses for that truth, and guardians both of its honour and integrity, we shall lift up our voice against the evil in whatever quarter it may show itself.

The Seventh Vial; being an Exposition of the Apocalypse, &c. Second Edition, with Supplementary Chapter. J. Johnstone. 1848.

HAVING already stated our opinion upon this volume, we need not return to it at length. The supplementary chapter brings down the exposition to December, 1848. It is interesting, though not entirely after our mind. There is so little in the present European struggle with which a Christian can sympathize on either side, that we must express our dissent from some of the author's statements regarding the anti-despotic movement. Believing that it has been by the sword of despotism, that Satan has hitherto contrived to thrust the Gospel and the Bible out of Europe, we see without pity the strokes of Divine vengeance by which thrones are broken to pieces; but still we do not assent to the statement of the author, that "it is a grand movement of mind which is bearing up and onward" the opposing ranks, or that it is a movement which, in the main, is in harmony with the longings and aspirations of mankind, and the bright anticipations of all ages respecting the future."—P. 445.

Both movements, we believe, to be from beneath, not from above, and with such sentiments we can have no sympathy. Popery and despotism are hateful and hideous enough, but are they more so than Infidelity and anarchy?

Digitized by Google

Sermons. By the late THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D. Illustrative of Different Stages in his Ministry. Edinburgh: 1849.

THIS is a very remarkable volume. Its *literary value* cannot fail to draw the attention of those who may feel desirous of tracing the development of a mind, which exerted more influence on society than any other we are acquainted with since the days of Milton; for here they will find not only that massive diction, which its author (though none but he) wielded in after-days, with such wondrous effect, struck out in all its vivid peculiarities by the student of eighteen; but the great thoughts, which he spent a lifetime in realizing, on pauperism and Church Establishments, do not seem to have been less clearly defined by the licentiate when just entering on his ministry, than by the veteran professor when his name acted as a spell over Europe. This is the marvel, that in style and speculation, the Chalmers of 1798 is identical with the Chalmers of 1843. Let our readers peruse the sermon on "Courteousness," and say if anything more compact, vehement, and lofty ever proceeded from its author's pen. There is nothing in Collier or Johnson more terse in sentiment, or more felicitous in composition, regarding it simply as a moral essay.

The volume is likewise a *theological curiosity*, showing, as it does, the estimate that at one time was formed of Evangelical truth by the moderate party in the Church of Scotland, and the unmeasured contempt with which they must have taught their students to view that system. When but attending the Divinity Hall, Chalmers denounces the doctrine of justification by faith, as the source and shelter of all iniquity, not excepting plunder, and lust, and murder. And his discourse, it is important to remember, must have met with the approval of Principal Hill, the Professor of Theology at St. Andrew's, and author of "Lectures on Divinity."

It is chiefly, however, as a contribution to Chalmers' *religious history*, that this volume possesses such surpassing interest, for if it opens with showing us the author as the most unsparing and vituperative adversary of the truth as it is in Jesus, it advances but a little way, when it exhibits him as a champion of the faith he once sought to destroy, not less intrepid and magnanimous than Luther or Knox. We always knew that this change had its root, not in the judgment, but in the heart;—that it was not the result so much of doctrinal conviction, as of regenerative conversion. But hitherto we had imagined that it was a change as sudden as it was vast. Our impression was, that Chalmers had gone into the chamber of sickness a sceptic, if not an atheist, and came forth a believer. This volume makes it evident that this idea is erroneous. From the time he attended the Hall of Theology, at least, Chalmers must have been thoroughly assured that Christianity was of God, and even then his mind must have been honestly subjected to the influence of its truth. But bereavement, and sickness, and the apprehension of death, in the hand of the Holy Ghost, carried the work to its completion, and for the sake of Scotland and the world—

Digitized by Google

for the salvation of numbers without number in his own age, and to the end of time, he was "translated out of darkness into marvellous light."

The Life of the Rev. John M'Donald, A.M., late Missionary at Calcutta, &c. By the Rev. W. K. Tweedie. Edinburgh: J. Johnstone, 1849.

In the afternoon of Tuesday, the 5th of September, 1837, we remember to have bid farewell to this apostolic man, as he was leaving Scotland for the shores of India. It was a bright autumn day. Along with one or two friends we met Mr. M'Donald at the house of a brother. After some refreshment we united in prayer, commending him and his partner to the Lord. We then proceeded to the steamer, the writer of this accompanying Mr. M'Donald, and enjoying his converse till we reached the pier. We remember well that during that short walk he spoke of various topics. In passing the church where Dr. Colquhoun once ministered, he mentioned the profit he had derived from the writings of that divine; at the same time remarking that "he was somewhat of a thief," as he had borrowed all his best thoughts from others, such as Witsius and Boston. He related also the brief story of a godly woman in the north, who went, in Gaelic, by the name of "the woman of great faith." A stranger visiting the place, met with her, and putting the question, "Are you the woman of great faith?" was answered, "No, I am the woman of little faith, but a great God." We "accompanied him to the ship," lingering on the pier, alongside of which the vessel was lying. We remember the last farewell signal,—the last glimpse we had of him as the steamer passed rapidly out. We saw him no more in the flesh, but we shall see him again when the Lord shall come to raise his sleeping saints, and change his living ones, that they may be for ever with him, and for ever with each other. On leaving the pier we did not separate, but returned again to unite in prayer, Dr. Duff leading our petitions, and again committing our brother to the Lord of sea and land.

He was a man of apostolic character; calm, simple, child-like, loving, yet firm and brave, counting not his life dear to him, that he might fulfil his ministry. He walked with God as few walk; he laboured for God as few labour, consecrating a mind of no inferior order, and a body too frail for the zealous spirit, to the service of his beloved Lord.

This volume is a precious one; excellent in its materials, and no less so in the way in which these have been laid out and woven together by the biographer,—a man of like spirit with the departed.

The remarks by Mr. M'Donald on Edward Irving, and on the scenes and doctrines of which he formed the centre, are just and candid. Not less so are his biographer's. We, too, mourn over these days. We mourn over the fall of that noble, but far-erring minister. And we mourn over the way in which prophetic truth was at that time

Digitized by Google

brought into disrepute. Let us keep these days before our eye as a beacon. They may be most useful in this way, if in no other.

Two Charts; with Key: the Seventy Weeks of Daniel; the Cycle of Seventy Weeks, &c.

A Chart; entitled, A Prophetical Stream of Time, &c. By Sir EDWARD DENNY, Bart. London: J. Nisbet and Co.

THESE Charts embrace so many points, both historical and prophetical, some of them, to us at least, very doubtful, that we feel ourselves precluded at present from entering at length into the discussion of them, and also from giving them an unqualified recommendation. At the same time, they contain so much that is true, and so much that is useful, that we should be doing great injustice to them and to their accomplished designer, did we not call the attention of our readers to them. They are most beautiful in their execution, and are well fitted for giving shape, order, and consecutiveness to the thoughts of those who allow themselves to float along in vague and disorderly musings, which never fall into aught like system or clearness.

Italy and the Gospel: Letters and Discourses of Celio Curio, translated from the Italian Edition of 1552, *&c.* London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1848.

A MOST valuable relic of Italy in the olden time,—Italy in the days when gleams of the Gospel seemed to be finding their way into her dark recesses. That same Italy now lies open to the Gospel. Let us seize the hour, and pour in the light of God.

Hymns and Thoughts for the Sick and Lonely. By a LADY. London: J. Nisbet and Co.

THE "Thoughts" here are of a superior order, and the Hymns embody them in language of considerable expressiveness and vigour.

Gleanings from many Fields. Edinburgh: J. Johnstone. 1849.

A NEAT little volume, full of profitable thoughts. They are not only from many fields, but well gleaned.

Jesus Comes, and Quickly. By the Rev. W. ROGERS. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1849.

THERE is much of very excellent matter to be found in this work. It is scriptural and spiritual.

Digitized by Google

Letters to the Author of "The Seventh Vial;" relative particularly to the Identification of the Prophetic History of the Two Witnesses with that of the True Church generally, during the Apocalyptic Period of 1260 *Years, and the Completion of their History.* By the Rev. Alexander Beith, Stirling. Edinburgh: W. P. Kennedy, 1849. Pp. 83.

The late period at which this little work has come into our hands forbids the attempt to give any lengthened review of its contents. But we can say that it will repay perusal, even by those who may differ from the author in the conclusions to which he has come. One object which he has had in view, is the refutation of Mr. Elliott's theory as to "the two witnesses." In substituting an interpretation of his own, his main position is, that the "witnesses constitute a body distinct from the Church, or sealed ones, though of it; peculiarly set apart from the general body of believers, and having a prophetic history of their own." His arguments in support of this position are worthy of attention, but from one of them we feel constrained to express our dissent. Of the witnesses it is said, "These are the two olive trees and the two candlesticks, standing before the God of the earth." In his remarks upon the vision of Zechariah, to which these words bear obvious reference, Mr. Beith supposes that the two olive trees on the right and left side of the candlestick "were seen as *separate candlesticks*—branches." And while the candlestick of the temple is the emblem of the Church, he holds that "the *two minor candlesticks*, or branches, or olive trees," were the types of the two witnesses who were afterwards to appear. We cannot conceive how the *olive trees* could appear as *candlesticks* at all. It seems clear to us, that when the expounding angel said, "These are the two olive trees and the two candlesticks," he referred to the *whole* vision before the eyes of the prophet, and not merely to the olive trees, as a part of it; and if it be asked why *two* candlesticks are mentioned, we would refer to the excellent commentary of Dr. Stonard on Zechariah, as proving that the object presented in vision to the prophet was not a *seven*-branched candlestick, but a double candlestick, having *fourteen* branches, seven on each side, and the bowl to hold the oil in the centre, on the top of the upright stem, so that it might well be explained as two candlesticks. If, then, the witnesses are the two candlesticks, and these are the same as the double candlestick of the prophet; and if that candle be, as Mr. Beith supposes, the type of the whole Church, the conclusion to be drawn is the very reverse of that which our author contends for.

We are spared the necessity of discussing the particular conclusion to which he has arrived, as to *who* the witnesses are, by an admission which he makes in the Postscript to his letters. He there says, that it is essential to his theory that "the slayer of the witnesses be the Roman empire, in the form of the wild beast *out of the sea.*" Now, we hold that the negative of this proposi-

Digitized by Google

tion is demonstrable, and shall restrict ourselves to making a few observations on this point. Mr. Beith admits (p. 32) that Daniel's ten-horned beast is identical "with (1,) the red dragon, seven-headed, ten-horned,—*crowns on the heads;* (2,) the beast from the sea, or 'deep,' seven-headed, ten-horned,—crowns on the horns; and (3,) the scarlet-coloured beast, seven-headed, ten-horned,—crowns neither on the head nor horns." We are at a loss to understand how, after this admission, he should say, "We are fully warranted to conclude, that one and the same power is described as the beast from *the bottomless pit* (ἀβυσσος, Rev. xi. 7), and as the beast from the *sea* (θαλασσα, Rev. xiii. 1)." For each of the three symbolic creatures mentioned in the first of these extracts has its own appropriate locality assigned to it in the vision. The dragon is first seen in heaven, and afterwards on the earth. (Rev. xii. 3, 9.) The beast of Rev. xiii. arises out of the *sea.* The scarlet-coloured beast ascends out of the *bottomless pit.* (Rev. xvii. 8.) When, therefore, in the history of the witnesses it is incidentally mentioned that they are slain by the beast that ascendeth out of *the bottomless pit,* we are bound to conclude that the slayer is the scarlet-coloured beast, with crownless heads and horns; and as this beast, according to our author, has not yet made his appearance, it must follow as a consequence, that the witnesses are not yet slain. The only way of avoiding this conclusion is, by maintaining, as Mr. Elliott does, that the beast from the sea and the scarlet-coloured beast are identical; but as Mr. Beith repudiates this theory, we contend that he is bound, in consistency, to admit that the beast from the sea is not the slayer of the witnesses. The same conclusion seems to follow from the fact that the witnesses are slain at the close of the 1260 years of their prophesying. For this period is identical with the reign of the beast from the sea. (Rev. xiii. 5.) All this time he is making war with them; but he cannot slay them. Surely the time of his greatest triumph cannot be after his reign is over. But when his place is filled by the scarlet-coloured beast, *then* are the witnesses slain. We are perfectly content to join issue with our author on this single point, waiving all other objections to his interpretation.

Meditations on the Song of Solomon. London: Campbell. 1848.

An admirable, though brief exposition of this book. It is full of excellent thought, as well as clear and satisfactory interpretation.

Hymns and Poems. By Sir Edward Denny, Bart. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1848.

Many of these Hymns are very graceful; full of tender feeling, and rich in spirituality. Christ, both in his first and second comings, is their unceasing theme.

Digitized by Google

Extracts.

Why our Lord uses the figure of "a thief," to set forth the circumstances of his Second Coming.

HAVING spoken of disciples as "*servants*,"—which he does when referring to them as active in efforts for his cause, even as elsewhere he calls them "*Virgins*," when pointing to them as receptive and contemplative, in respect of his truth,—the Lord added a parable. In his parable (Luke xii. 37—40) he warns them that the Master's coming back may be very unexpected, by joining to the comparison of the Master at a distance, the idea of the *assault of a thief* on those in the house.—"That this comparison has absolutely no meaning beyond expressing the idea of suddenness, is certainly not probable. It is, in the first place, used in the New Testament so commonly with reference to the return of Christ (Matt. xxiv. 43; 2 Pet. iii. 10; Rev. iii. 3; xvi. 15), that we cannot fail to suppose some special reference to be implied in the expression. Further, we must not overlook the reason why some nobler comparison, of which so many must have presented themselves, was not selected in order to show forth the suddenness. And, finally, the accurate filling up of the figure in some of the passages (for example here, and at Matt. xxiv. 43), according to which the master of the house is set in opposition to the thief, and the breaking in of the latter depicted, is not calculated to support the opinion which refuses to lay any stress on the various features of the comparison itself. Rather does the remark made on Matt. ix. 16, apply here, that our Lord frequently uses figurative expressions, taken from the standing point of his enemies. In this case, the comparison of the (κλεπτης) thief is taken from the feelings of those who, amidst the life and movement of earth, view themselves as in their own proper home. These take fright at the coming of the Son of Man, as at the in-breaking of a thief; through him they believe it is all over with their (supposed) property and possessions. Here, then, is seen the feeling of all worldly-minded men, concentrated, as it were, in the good man of the house (ὁικοδεσποτης), under whom we can (according to Matt. xii. 29; Luke xi. 21) understand no other than the ἀρχων τοῦ κοσμου τουτου, "prince of this world." Thus understood, the comparison acquires, on the one hand, its own definite meaning, and on the other, there is also assigned a ground for the uncertainty of our Lord's return. It seems, however, an obscure point, how this comparison of the (κλεπτης) thief can be interwoven with that of the (δουλοι) servants, as is done in this passage and at Matt. xxiv. 43. The ground of it is probably this: the apostles themselves, although, on the one side, they are the representatives of the "kingdom of God" (ver. 32), yet appear, on the other, as by no means removed from the region of the world (κοσμος); they still bear the worldly element within them (1 John ii. 16), and require, for this reason, very earnest admonitions to fidelity, and warnings against

Digitized by Google

unfaithfulness (ver. 9, 10, 47, 48). In so far, however, as the disciples themselves still belong to the region of the world (κοσμος), in so far do they also share its character; they cherish fear, namely, for the manifestation of the Divine, and for this reason could the Lord here conjoin two things apparently foreign to each other. Like the disciples, every believer bears a double character; as a member of the kingdom of God, he is "a servant of God;" in so far, however, as the old man, and, consequently, the world, lives within him, he carries in himself that which is enmity against God, and, according to this position, he must partly long for, and partly dread, the coming of the Lord, as that act which shall reveal the "secrets of man" (κρυπτα τῶν ἀνθρωπων). According to that standing point of exalted contemplation, therefore, from which the Saviour spoke, he viewed all the separate individuals in the connexion which their lives bore to the whole, and found the key of heaven and hell, of bliss and anguish, in the hearts of each."—*Olshausen on the Gospels,* vol. ii., pp. 328-9, in Foreign Theological Library.

The Coming of Elias.

"But the question is, whether it is to be believed that the Old Testament prophecy above referred to, has been completely fulfilled in the appearance of St. John, or in the mission of Elijah on the occasion of the transfiguration of Christ. One feels inclined to doubt it, when we read that the prophet Malachi adds (iv. 5): "That Elijah would be sent *before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord.*" The supposition, therefore, that this prophecy (although, as implying a reference to a certain person, it be fulfilled) must be regarded as yet unfulfilled, seems not improbable. As it is the nature of all the Old Testament prophecies, that the object of the prophecy can be *represented* in a previous manifestation *without its meaning being exhausted,* so it is, in like manner, here. The period at which Christ lived was by no means, it is true, the prophesied "great day of the Lord;" but that entire period, up to the destruction of Jerusalem, *bore a certain resemblance to the latter days,* and had, in like manner, an element (the Baptist St. John), which typified the future appearance of Elijah. It is probable, that from this chain of ideas proceeded the indefinite, "If ye will (wish to) receive it." . . . . (Matt. xi. 14.) "As the Tishbite once laboured of old, as *emendator sacrorum,*" so he shall come forth also at his second appearance. He is no creator of a new order of things in the spiritual life, but, by strictness and earnestness for the law, he stems the course of sinful confusion, and re-introduces a state of order. Into this scene, *Messiah* steps forth as Creator. . . . For the appearance of Elijah at the transfiguration as little exhausted the prediction of the prophet (Mal. iv. 5), as did the sending forth of the Baptist. *Each was merely a prefiguration,* adapted to Christ's first appearance in his humiliation (which the Old Testament more plainly marks as distinct from his second coming), but the prophecy itself remains, awaiting its fulfilment at Christ's future appearance."—*Olshausen on the Gospels,* pp. 63 and 237.

Digitized by Google

What occasioned Thoughts of Antichrist.

"The impression which this first and truly horrible persecution, by a man who presented so noticeable a contrast with the great historical phenomenon of Christianity, left behind it, endured for a long time on the minds of Christians. Nor was it altogether without truth, when the image of the Antichrist, the representative of that last reaction of the power of ungodliness against the Divine government and against Christianity, was transferred to so colossal an exhibition of self-will rebelling against all holy restraints, and even passing over to the side of the unnatural, as was presented in the character of Nero. It may often be observed, that the impression left by a man in whom an important principle connected with the history of the world has manifested itself, or from whom a great power of destruction has gone forth, is not so immediately effaced, nor room allowed for the thought, that such a person has really ceased to exist; as we see in the examples of the Emperor Frederick II., and of Napoleon. So it was in the case of this monstrous exhibition of the power of evil. . . . . The rumour prevailed amongst the Heathen people that Nero was not dead, but had retired to some place of secrecy, from which he would again make his appearance—a rumour which several adventurers and impostors took advantage of for their own ends. Now this rumour assumed also a Christian dress, and it ran, that Nero had retired beyond the Euphrates, and would return as the Antichrist to finish what he already had begun—the destruction of that Babylon, the capital of the world."—*Neander's Church History*, vol. i., p. 130.

"The doctrine of the Millennium, or the reign of saints on earth a thousand years, is now rejected by all Roman Catholics, and by the greatest part of Protestants; and yet it passed among the best of Christians, for two hundred and fifty years, for a tradition *apostolical*, and, as such, is delivered by many fathers of the second and third century, *who speak of it as the tradition of our Lord and his apostles*, and of all the ancients who lived before them, who tell us the very words in which it was delivered, the Scriptures which were then so interpreted; and say that it was held by *all Christians that were exactly orthodox*."—*Whitby's "Treatise on Traditions."*

"The dead saints, at the appearance of Christ, are to be organized again with the material bodies. This is to take place a thousand years before the awakening of the other dead. . . . . They are to reside again upon earth, and to live and reign with Christ for a thousand years."—*Gess's "Revelation of God in his Word,"* pp. 227-8.

"The latter chapters of Ezekiel, describing the erection of a certain temple, are involved in so much obscurity, that it seems difficult to

Digitized by Google

arrive at any determinate conclusion respecting the import of that mysterious prophecy. It is certain that the attempt to spiritualize it produces little besides perplexity and confusion; nor have we any example in Scripture of an allegory so perfectly dark and enigmatic as it must be confessed to be on that supposition."—*Robert Hall's Works*, vol. iv., p. 405.

"It appears to me evident, that the scene of the future conversion of the Jews in their own land, where it is probable from Zechariah, *that a supernatural interposition of the Messiah will take place in their favour.*"—*Ibid.*, vol. iv., p. 404.

"None ever saw this world as it was in its first creation, but only Adam and his wife; neither shall any ever see it until the manifestation of the children of God,—that is, until the redemption or resurrection of the saints. . . . . Adam, therefore, as a type of Christ, reigned in the Church almost a thousand years. The world, therefore, beginning thus, doth show us how it will end, viz., by the reign of the second Adam, as it began with the reign of the first. These long-lived men, therefore, show us the glory that the Church shall have in the latter day, even in the seven thousandth year of the world, *that Sabbath when Christ shall set up his kingdom on earth.* According to that which is written: 'They lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.' . . . . Hence, therefore, in the first place, the dragon is chained for these thousand years."—*John Bunyan on the First Chapters of Genesis.*

"Christ did never actually deny his having such a visible glorious kingdom upon earth as that which his disciples looked for; only he corrected their error as to the time of this kingdom's appearing. Christ did not say to them that there should never be any such restoration of the kingdom to Israel as their thoughts were running upon; only he telleth them that the times and seasons were not for them to know; thereby acknowledging that such a kingdom should indeed be as they did from the holy prophets expect. Herein was their error, not in expecting a glorious appearance of the kingdom of God, but in that they made account that this would be immediately."
—*The Mystery of Israel's Salvation, by Increase Mather.* 1669.

Digitized by Google

Correspondence.

IS THE APOCALYPSE FULFILLED OR UNFULFILLED ?—No. II.

To the Editor of the " Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

Dear Sir,—In my last I endeavoured to vindicate the important truth called in question by my Reviewer in your pages, that the great end of prophecy is to enlighten God's people concerning the future in the way of consolation and warning; and that thus alone it answers the Divine definition—"a light shining in a dark place until the day dawn." It would not suffice for the mariner, we know, to descry the lighthouse when he is just upon it; but, keeping it in view when at a distance from him, he thereby takes his observations, and guides his ship accordingly. It is thus in regard to the word of prophecy. From thence, amidst the perilous ocean of this evil age which the believer has to navigate, there beams a heavenly light which illumines his horizon and reveals the surrounding objects through which lies his course. Like the mariner, after making the harbour, or avoiding the shoal, by the aid of the friendly signal, he may pause to admire its construction, and appreciate, with more lively emotion, the sagacity and skill of the devising artist; but he is not to forget, that *in its acting as a signal* lay the Artist's chief design. The recognition of this by the believer serves, I maintained, to explode from his mind all those interpretations of prophecy which have never answered the end of guiding the Church beforehand, and especially Mr. Elliott's interpretation of the Apocalypse, which makes it, in a great measure, already fulfilled,—inasmuch as the alleged fulfilment of it has confessedly taken place without any portion of the Church, even those most concerned, having anticipated it.

I now proceed, with your permission, to confirm another important point advanced by me, namely, that in the interpretation of the Book of the Revelation, we should scrupulously beware of proceeding upon hypothesis, *apart from experimental examination of the text.* The evil effect of this has, alas! been demonstrated, on a large scale, in the case of the Jewish nation, who, without examination of Old Testament prophecy, were led by their hypothesis, as we may call it, of an *immediately* reigning Messiah, to reject the Son of God when he came to them in lowly and suffering form. They overlooked the truth, that Messiah was to suffer first, and then to enter into his glory; and so they stumbled at the very foundation-stone of all their hopes, and have been broken as a nation ever since. In the same way the Christian Church, for many ages, and a multitude of Christians, even now, have come to the reading of the Scriptures with the notion in their minds, that the world is to be converted by the preaching of the Gospel under this dispensation; and so the most palpable statements of the Word concerning the pre-millennial advent, and the restoration of the Jews, are perverted from their simple meaning, to give a corresponding testimony; whereas, if, renouncing their traditionary prejudices, they examined the Scriptures fairly and without bias, they would see, that of this, as of all preceding dispensations, apostasy is the predicted issue, and that the consummation of a converted world is to result only from the Lord Jesus appearing in glory and building up Zion, employing her children to make known his saving health amongst the nations. To descend from these solemn considerations, we may also call to mind the story of the would-be philosophers who racked their brains to no purpose to discover why the dead fish weighed more than when alive, when all the while the difference in question existed only in their own minds, as they at length ascertained by actual experiment. Surely an instructive moral may thus be read to us upon the vanity and mischief of resting the interpretation of the Apocalypse on *mere hypothesis.* Most legitimate it is, from an acquaintance with other books of

Digitized by Google

Scripture, having gathered the method of the revealing Spirit, to presume, *from analogy*, that the same may obtain here. But even this opening key, furnished from other Scriptures, we must delicately use; for the book before us, the Apocalypse, may be characterized by such peculiarity as to render it an exception to the rule, and the precious treasure of its contents may be accessible only by the key which itself furnishes.

Such was the burden of my remarks, under the head of "*mere hypothesis no right starting-point of interpretation*," in the pamphlet reviewed in your first number.* Only the single illustration which I there employed was taken from the well-known fact of the Ptolemaic system of astronomy, which so long held the human intellect in bondage, having been, in like manner, the offspring of hypothesis. The hypothesis in question, that the earth was the centre of our planetary system, was a very plausible one; for apparently the earth moved not; whereas, the sun and the other heavenly bodies seemed to revolve around it. But, in the light of experimental philosophy, all this was discovered to be a mistake, the apparent motion of the sun being produced by the earth turning on its own axis. Now, how does my Reviewer reply to this, in behalf of Mr. Elliott? In the first place, by retorting on me, that I have equally dealt in presumptions myself. He thus writes:—

"Now if all presumptions are mischievous, and opposed to the sound maxims of inductive inquiry, it is surely very unwise to spend so much time and pains in the attempt to establish an opposite presumption in favour of the Futurist exposition. After all, it seems that presumptions, in the abstract, are not an evil, but only such as clash with our own favourite views."

In reference to this attempted satire upon my consistency, it is only necessary for me to remind our readers, that the presumptions I had advanced as legitimate, in contrast with Mr. Elliott's, *were those suggested by the analogy of Scripture in general;* and, after calling attention to such, I only denominated them "*dispensational truths*," "*capital points of information*," on which the student of "*the Revelation*" *should not be ignorant.*† And I even dismissed their consideration with these remarks:—"I now enter upon an examination of the actual contents of the Apocalypse; and I humbly pray for myself and readers that we may have our minds disengaged from the influence of all *à priori* considerations as to its import. Let this portion of the word speak for itself. It may, or may not, find its place at once in our system composed from other Scriptures. It may fit in easily to a vacant niche, or it may oblige us, by a dislocation of our system, to make room for it. And this reflection ought to suggest to us, as long as any part of the Sacred Word is obscure to us, to beware of compacting any system too closely. But, still, it is well to be furnished with scriptural knowledge from other parts of God's Word, *and it is in this light, not simply as rebutting Mr. Elliott's gratuitous presumptions, I attach importance to the topics already discussed in these pages.*" ‡ How my Reviewer could have read the foregoing and similar passages of my pamphlet, and yet charge me with a predilection for mere hypotheses of any kind, I am really at a loss to imagine. But to proceed, he continues:—

"The whole objection, however, is doubly and entirely groundless, both in its general principle, and in its application to the Horæ, and the usual course of Apocalyptic interpretation. And first, it is quite untrue in its general principle. Some previous hypothesis is needful in almost every step of inductive inquiry. Presumptive evidence needs, almost in every case, to prepare the way of exact and full inquiry."

Of course, after this, the readers of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy" would suppose that my objection to arguing from hypothesis was urged too generally, and without sufficient discrimination; but what will they think when they learn that, in the most explicit way, I had disclaimed calling in question *the legitimate use of hypothesis*, that my Reviewer contends for. My words were: "Of course it is not intended by these remarks to object to the method pursued

* "Apocalyptic Interpretation; or, the Apocalypse intelligible, not in any History of the past, as alleged by the Rev. E. B. Elliott, but in the Light of the Day when the Son of Man is revealed." Nisbet and Co., London.

† "Apocalyptic Interpretation," pp. 52—55.

‡ Page 53.

Digitized by Google

with such success, even in physical science, of sounding, as it were, in the field of knowledge, by some strictly provisional hypothesis, or '*precogitation*,' as Lord Bacon has it, to be at once relinquished, if not responded to by the facts educed. The *Word*, equally with the works of God, may be reverently and profitably questioned in this way. What is excepted to, as in Mr. Elliott's procedure, is the framing of hypotheses irrespective even of a general survey of the ground to be explored, and then ingeniously straining every thing to fit them, as though they were indubitably correct; intermingling, moreover, these hypotheses with the progress of the inductive argument; whereas, according to all law of legitimate reasoning, the two considerations ought to have been scrupulously kept distinct, so as to let the verdict of experiment fairly test the proffered theory."

To the above rule, moreover, I had, in the same pamphlet, evinced *practical* deference. For, after urging my view of the import of the Apocalypse, derived from the analogy of Scripture, I thus continue: "A careful, experimental examination of the Apocalypse may show this view to be right or wrong, and I do not now go into that part of the question. All I insist on, is, that the *analogy* of Scripture prophecy, so far as it goes, would indicate such to be the character of the Apocalypse, instead of that which Mr. Elliott assumes."* Surely, the art of the Reviewer is strikingly illustrated in his suppression of these qualifying clauses of his author's argument, added for the sake of *accuracy*, and then quietly producing his own digest of them, to substantiate his charge of *inaccuracy*. May I not ask how would his defence of Mr. Elliott appear, if, to this distinction between the legitimate and illegitimate use of hypotheses, he had been induced to add, as candour might have suggested, that his author had himself spoken to the very same effect, but had maintained that *Mr. Elliott's hypŏtheses* were not to be regarded as coming under the former head? With such an admission, my Reviewer's proposition concerning my objection, that it was *groundless in its general principle*, would hardly fail, I think, of being estimated by his readers as a mere flourish. Nor can the following language, I submit, be otherwise characterized:—

> "The Ptolemaic system only confirms and illustrates the same principle. In its own day, it was really the ripest fruit of inductive inquiry, as much as the Newtonian system in our own times. Hipparchus and Ptolemy, to whom we owe it, were not loose theorists, but the most accurate and careful observers of ancient times."

Now, with all respect, what has this general strain of commendation of Hipparchus, and his successor, Ptolemy, to do with the question in hand? Except, indeed, this, to which it was not, of course, the Reviewer's object to call attention, that Mr. Elliott's "Horæ Apocalypticæ" should not be compared with the system of astronomy derived from these celebrated men; for the latter, with all its unsound hypothesis of the sun moving round the earth, did, nevertheless, combine with it the result of many useful observations, such as the tables adverted to, computations of eclipses, and catalogues of the fixed stars, &c.; whereas the former, Mr. Elliott's book, apart from its principles of interpretation, is only valuable, as has been well said, "*as a technica memoria of Roman history*." The wrong of omitting to make this distinction, I thus repair at my Reviewer's instigation, though, perhaps, he will not be pleased now at eliciting it. Still, that the general principle of my objection against arguing from mere hypothesis, *is* illustrated by the case of the Ptolemaic system of astronomy, is a position not to be yielded up to my Reviewer; and, indeed, his counter assertion of the latter being the "fruit of inductive inquiry," quite startled me at first by its novelty, until I observed the not-very-prominent qualification prefixed to it, which certainly renders it innocent enough; for, the whole sentence runs thus: "*In its own day*, it (the Ptolemaic system) was really the ripest fruit of inductive inquiry." It is really amazing to see how thus, by a little word or two hid, as it were, in the corner, a proposition most glaringly untrue in its appearance can be made to turn out sufficiently defensible by the author, though, certainly, at the expense of his character for plainness of speech; for, "*in its own day*," the doctrine of our earth being the centre of the planetary

* "Apocalyptic Interpretation," pp. 15, 46.

Digitized by Google

system, was, we may admit, the *ripest* fruit of inductive inquiry—in the sense, however, that anything may be said to be the superlative of nothing! For, at the time in question, *that doctrine only* existed; but that it was not the fruit of inductive inquiry at all, but an erroneous hypothesis, is plain, from the fact that inductive inquiry put an end to it. In the same way, my Reviewer's eulogium of Hipparchus and Ptolemy is disposed of. Granting they were "the most accurate and careful observers of ancient times," this only shows that, in regard to the point in question, *bad was the best*,—they were not accurate and careful *enough*, but proceeded in their labours on a gratuitous supposition.

Indeed, from what my Reviewer says of the Ptolemaic system, one would almost think, that, up to Ptolemy's time, the science of astronomy had been progressively advancing towards maturity, under a process of careful induction, prosecuted still further by Ptolemy himself! Whereas, in point of fact, he and his more immediate predecessors were innovators on the ancient and true system of Pythagoras, afterwards revived by Copernicus, and confirmed and demonstrated by our own Newton; and similar to this is the imputation on Mr. Elliott of innovating by his theory upon apostolic and primitive interpretation. This brings me to another stage of my Reviewer's argument. He writes:—

"Next, in its immediate reference to the Horæ, and similar works, the objection is equally baseless. The presumption here referred to, is, in reality, only a postulate assumed for convenience of arrangement, while the question is fully and clearly discussed in another place. Mr. Elliott has elsewhere given his reasons, at great length, for rejecting both the Preterist and Futurist systems, not only in his Preface, but in two distinct supplements of considerable extent. To place this discussion in the forefront of a work designed for general readers, would be as unnatural and unwise, as to prefix to every almanac an abridgement of the "Principia," and a laboured proof of the Newtonian system. Hence no charge can be more destitute of the least shadow of truth, than the one thus carelessly advanced, that he has neglected even a general survey of the ground to be explored."

Now, first of all, it is necessary to submit to the reader the confession made by Mr. Elliott, upon which my Reviewer puts such a favourable construction. In the original preface to the Horæ, Mr. Elliott's words are, speaking of himself in the third person:—"*In commencing his researches after it* (the true import of the seals), *there were two preliminary presumptions on which he judged that he might safely proceed. The one presumption was, that, supposing the fortunes of the Roman world and Christendom, from St. John's time down to the consummation, to have been the subjects of apocalyptical figuration, the eras successively chosen by the Divine Spirit for delineation, must have been the most important and eventful in the history of Christendom.*" Here, the first presumption of Mr. Elliott, as I observed in my pamphlet, resolves itself into two,—1st, "That the Apocalypse treats of Roman history in connexion with the progress of Christianity from John's time forward. 2d, Of the most important periods of that history as estimated (we read in the body of the work) by the judgment of '*standard authorities*,' the *beau ideal* of whom, according to Mr. Elliott, is *Gibbon*, the Infidel historian!" All this, however, according to my Reviewer, is, "*in reality only a postulate assumed for convenience of arrangement.*" But is this the case? A postulate, if I mistake not, in its legitimate sense, is either an assumption against which no objection can be presumed to exist; or, which had been already proved by others; or, is proposed to be proved by the writer himself. Certainly, the first alternative cannot be predicated of Mr. Elliott's presumptions. Not even an antecedent probability attaches to them, for the Apostolic Church were advertised of the coming of their Lord to take them to himself as *an imminent thing;* and, with such expectation, it is hard to realize the consistency of a revelation to them of a long series of intervening events in Roman history. The second alternative is not more tenable. Nor have we even a reference by Mr. Elliott to any writer who has established his presumptions for him. Indeed, my Reviewer plainly implies, that it is only by virtue of the last, that is, *Mr. Elliott's own purpose to vindicate his presumptions against objections*, that the term *postulate* can be applied to them. But where have we such vindication? In vain is it looked for throughout his work. My Reviewer, indeed, says:—"Mr. Elliott has elsewhere given his reasons at great length

Digitized by Google

for both rejecting the Preterist and the Futurist system." But what has this to do with the question, which is, has Mr. Elliott given his reasons, and adequate reasons, *for presuming that the seals relate to Roman history as recorded by Gibbon?* His exposing, as he thinks, the difficulties of other systems of interpretation touches not this point. No more than the arguing, that a key produced for a given lock was more promising in its form than other keys, would affect the inquiry how such key was itself devised. After all, it might be, not only not the key required, but the mere result of a superficial guess, without examination of the wards of the lock. Thus other systems of Apocalyptic interpretation may be faulty, but showing this is no substitute for Mr. Elliott's proving his own *postulates*, to use his friend's favourable term. Were those postulates, indeed, as flatteringly hinted, analogous to the "Principia" of Newton, and Mr. Elliott's "Horæ to the Almanac;" *of course*, Mr. Elliott's readers should not look to him for any proof at all. But, with all its popularity, the *Horæ* has not attained to this *yet*.

At all events such prestige did not belong to the work *before it was born*, and therefore Mr. Elliott might have condescended to argue out the matter; at least, in his first edition. But the fact is, no edition, that I am aware of, supplies this desideratum; and this is affirmed *practically* by his friend, my Reviewer; for, we may suppose that the latter in following up his defence of Mr. Elliott's presumptions with *any* reasoning in behalf of them, would draw that reasoning, as indeed he does, from Mr. Elliott's lauded depository; and yet, what is its character? I cite his own words:—

"Whoever objects to them, *i.e.*, Mr. Elliott's *presumptions* (only from calling them 'postulates' before, he now advances to designate them '*maxims*,') must be prepared to maintain either that there is no principle of wise selection in the Divine prophecies; or, that it consists with the Divine wisdom to predict trifling changes rather than the more important, and to choose inappropriate rather than appropriate symbols to describe them."

Now, the obvious answer to this is, that we are not competent to decide upon what would constitute a *wise* selection of events for the roll of prophecy. Suppose, in regard to the historical facts of revelation, we were to determine beforehand of what subject-matter they should consist; for example, the Book of Genesis,—judging by human reason, the standard of my Reviewer, should we not conclude that that book would surely contain what ancient historians have devoted their pages to—the rise and fall of mighty empires? Yet, what is the fact when we come to examine it? Why, the greater part of it is taken up with the domestic history of the Patriarchs. So that that which in *our* esteem would have been so very important, has no importance *with God*. And, *vice versâ*, the record which we should have regarded as insignificant, and unworthy of Divine revelation, turns out to be of special moment. In fact, with one family the thoughts of God are occupied throughout the Scriptures of the Old Testament; and the history of the nations of the earth is only incidentally given, as they happen to have to do with that family. Who would have recognised the wisdom of this beforehand? In like manner, while Mr. Elliott and his friend may speculate concerning the contents of the Apocalypse, that it is to be presumed, as a matter of course, that they relate to those events that Gibbon, with his philosophic mind, has thought fit to record, the actual state of the case may be very different; and, indeed, on reflection, the child of God should apprehend as much, and that what the Infidel, with his carnal mind, judged to be of most prolific interest, the Holy Spirit of God would most likely pass by: "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are my ways your ways, saith the Lord." Hence, to lay down, *à priori*, what any portion of Scripture should relate to, is unbecoming in the extreme. It implies that we are competent judges of the fitness of the Divine purposes. All such arrogancy, then, we must utterly abjure, if we would profit by the Book of the Revelation. We must even be watchful against any bias as to its import operating upon us as we read it. What *we* may think expedient for God to do or predict, *He* may think very inexpedient. Who would have descried the expediency beforehand of that great mystery of Divine love, that God should give his only-begotten Son, out

Digitized by Google

of his bosom, to die for a sinful world? Does not the carnal mind even now revolt from it, and say, How can these things be?

But, further; may I not ask the writer of the above sentiments,—Does he forget that they have been used by the Infidel *against the whole volume of Inspiration?* Who does not know that such was the argument of the scoffing Voltaire and his unhappy associates in this country, who held up the Bible to scorn, because of its contents being what they are, taken up with the circumscribed ritual and laws of one solitary, isolated people, yea, with personal biographies, and little incidents of domestic life, whilst leaving almost unnoticed the vast empires of Egypt and Assyria. How is it possible, said they, that the Divine mind, with the whole course of the world's evolutions before it from the beginning, could have been occupied with such trifling topics? Thus was the wisdom of God derided as foolishness, just because the puny creature arrogated to determine what it was becoming in the Creator to do. And so our illustrious Bishop Butler (with whose Analogy I trust I may say, without offence, it would be well for my Reviewer to refresh his mind,) exposed the presumptuous and frivolous cavil. It may not be inapposite here to quote his sagacious words; and a remarkable instance it is of his comprehensive mind, that he delivers himself on the subject before us as though he had in view the very language of my Reviewer. To show this, I shall just put the one authority into juxtaposition with the other.

Two extracts from Butler, corrective of the two propositions of my Reviewer:—

REVIEWER.

"As for the two maxims themselves, whoever objects to them, must be prepared to maintain, either that there is no principle of wise selection in the Divine prophecies, or that it consists with the Divine wisdom to predict trifling changes, rather than the more important." *

BISHOP BUTLER.

"As we fall into infinite follies and mistakes, whenever we pretend, otherwise than from experience and analogy, to judge of the constitution and course of nature, it is evidently supposable beforehand, that we should fall into as great, in pretending to judge, in like manner, concerning revelation." . . .

"As we are in no sort judges beforehand, by what laws or rules, in what degree, or by what means, it were to have been expected that God would naturally instruct us; so, upon supposition of his affording us light and instruction by revelation, additional to what he has afforded us by reason and experience, we are in no sort judges by what methods, and in what proportion it were to be expected, that this supernatural light and instruction would be afforded us." . . .

REVIEWER.

"And to choose inappropriate, rather than appropriate symbols to describe them."

BISHOP BUTLER.

"There are several ways of arguing, which, though just with regard to other writings, are not applicable to Scripture, at least, not to the prophetic parts of it. We cannot argue, for instance, that this cannot be the sense or intent of such a passage of Scripture; for if it had, it would have been expressed more plainly, or have been represented under a more apt figure or hieroglyphic; yet we may justly argue thus with respect to common books. And the reason of this difference is very evident; that in Scrip-

Digitized by Google

ture we are not competent judges, as we are in common books, how plainly it were to have been expected what is the true sense should have been expressed, or under how apt an image figured. The only question is, what appearance there is that this is the sense; and scarce at all, how much more determinately or accurately it might have been expressed or figured."

Having thus explained and discriminated, I trust the nature of the position taken up by Mr. Elliott, and sought to be maintained by his friend, I need scarcely add, that I retain undiminished my objection against it; nor can I think it will commend itself to the readers of your Journal, by standing in need of such support as has now been adduced.

To the discussion of the remaining heads of my Reviewer's argument, including your own auxiliary remarks, I hope to address myself, if God will, in your subsequent numbers. May I, in common with all your Correspondents, be guided herein by the spirit of truth and love; and that so much the more, as we see the day approaching.

London, Feb. 12, 1849. Yours, &c., JAMES KELLY.

ON THE TWO BEASTS, IN REVELATION XIII.

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

THIS Paper is designed to establish the interpretation, that the Papacy is indicated by the vision of the *second* beast, and not by the vision of the *first* beast in the 13th chapter of the book of Revelation. If the remarks to be offered, be not thought sufficient to settle the question in favour of this view, they may be of some use, if they raise the question, whether something more is not requisite than the advocates of the opinion, that the Papacy is held forth by the first vision, have been in the habit of advancing, in order to identify the Papacy with the first vision. It is not intended to pre-occupy the reader's mind with a detail of objections which might be urged against the more commonly received interpretation, and thus to conciliate a favourable consideration of the views which we advocate; but simply to submit the opinions, which we have formed, to the judgment of students of prophecy.

In order to have on our minds an adequate idea of the social evil designed to be represented by the vision of a monstrous horned beast, we must also have a distinct conception of the Christian condition of society, which would exist, were the power which the beast wields to have been exercised by Christ. Laying aside all controversy respecting such questions, as, whether it was designed that a "clerical order," or separate class of office-bearers, should exist in the Church or "kingdom of heaven;" and whether any one form of Church government has claims over another, we have, from the mouth of our Lord himself, a description of the spirit and conduct which he requires of all who claim to be his ministers. In Matt. xx., our Lord says, "*Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them; but it shall not be so among you,*" &c. If, therefore, we find in any community or state of society, a Church in which secular ambition, lordly dominion, and self-interested oppression, such as too frequently characterize secular rulers, are the most marked features of Churchmen; if they require to be ministered unto, exact homage and service, instead of "ministering unto," after the spirit and example of Him who gave himself a ransom for many, such an ecclesiastical system is, in its rise and operation, fitly represented as a beast, or bestial power.

It is matter of unquestionable history, that a Church, or ecclesiastical system of this character, had overspread Christendom before the rise of the Papacy. Hierarchical usurpation is older than the Papacy; and this system was at first

Digitized by Google

opposed, in fact and in interest, to the powers arrogated by the Papacy. The Church existed over the whole extent of the Roman Empire as a system of affiliated national or provincial churches held in union, not merely by their common relation to the Imperial Head, but by their common faith and interest. Guizot, in speaking of what civilization had derived from the wreck of the Roman Empire, and while assigning its due influence to the municipal system, and to the ideas of empire and of imperial majesty, notices the influence of the Church as a "society founded on totally distinct principles, having its own Government revenues, means for independent action; and rallying points suitable to a great society, provincial, national, and commercial councils. It is not too much to affirm," he says, "that at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century, it was the Church with its institutions, its magistrates, its temporal power, which strove triumphantly against the internal dissolution which convulsed the empire, and against barbarity,—which subdued the barbarians themselves, and became the link, the medium and principle of civilization *as between the Roman and barbarian worlds.* Hence it is the state of the Church rather than of Christianity properly so called in the fifth century, which ought to be investigated in order to discover in what Christianity has, from that period, aided modern civilization, and what elements it has introduced."

We have quoted these observations from Guizot, and might add similar passages from other writers, in order to show that, at this time, the Church was rising, and felt to be a great worldly power. It is to this period in the world's history, to the transition-period from Roman Imperial greatness to the state of things which existed when society, after the dissolution of the empire, became settled—if settled it could be called, when "the Normal state was war and peace the exception,"—that the first vision refers. It regards the empire as in the state of dissolution, and presents us with the character of that new state of things which arose and continued to exist until the Bishop of Rome became Pope and supreme head of the Universal Church. At this era, it may be said, had religion been more pure, it would have been less powerful *as an earthly agent* in general society. Prophecy does not seem to lay any store by the fact of the Imperial power having become Christian; it permits it to pass to the account of the Pagan Imperial term or period. And although seven heads are spoken of, yet, as in the case of the apostles, where they were always spoken of as *the Twelve*, it would seem to be so here. There is *an eighth* head, viz., the Papal: and *the seventh*—of which more after this—we take to be the state of things which existed when the episcopal counts, or feudal bishops, sprung into existence, having at least co-ordinate jurisdiction with the feudal barons. Before the dissolution of the empire, the codes of that period show that the clergy were invested with civil functions. But we find, as soon as the light of authentic history falls on the state of society which emerged out of the ruins occasioned by the barbaric invasion, and in the formation of which the Church was in itself the great instrument and healing agent, that the bishop claimed or enjoyed a civil jurisdiction, as of right belonging to his sacred function. Episcopal authority, thus entrenched in civil authority, was chiefly exerted, as Ranke expresses it, in the maintenance of all sorts of exemptions, dues, and claims, which had little in common with religion. Personal and mental slavery were maintained; and in the Church of this period, Christianity had merged itself, more than at the time to which Taylor refers, "into a system of boundless superstition,—a system of fear, spiritual servitude scrupulously visible, magnificence of worship, mystery, artifice, juggle." And there is reason to think that, in consequence of the expedients to which recourse was had in order to gain over their barbarian masters, the system of evil which prevailed in the Church might have been even worse than Popery itself was, when the evil principles adopted had become more defined and duly regulated.

We thus conclude the beast of the first vision to be, not Rome Pagan, as distinguished from Rome Papal, the second beast; nor the civil power of the Pope, as distinguished from the ecclesiastical; nor yet the Papal power, as distinguished from that of its orders and decretals; but the new, and nominally Christian, but antichristian structure of society which intervened on the disso-

Digitized by Google

lution of the empire, and the rise of the ten kingdoms. Let us read the vision according to this idea.

And I stood upon the sand of the sea; or, contemplated the world on the verge or eve of the great convulsions which shook and overturned society to its foundations, on the dissolution of the Roman empire: *And I saw a beast rise out of the sea having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads, the name, Blasphemy.* It has been truly said, that Christianity has no difficulties which ought for a moment to stagger any well-informed, sound mind, excepting such as attach to its history. Its history has been a blasphemy, too often, against itself and its Author. Any one who will mark how Chubb, in his "True Gospel," Gibbon, and others, assail Christianity, must often be struck at the accuracy with which its genuine *principles* are adduced, and made to bear hard against the arrogant pretensions of its various *forms*, in ancient or modern times. Thus the Infidel and genuine Christian read blasphemy on the front of such corruptions as arose in the ten kingdoms. *The beast which I saw was like a leopard,* &c. *And the dragon gave him his power,* &c. The devil would readily relinquish his ancient Polytheism for the patronage of such an engine of blasphemy as had sprung up. An adulterated Christianity is only a baptized Paganism. *And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and the deadly wound was healed.* The heads are the successive forms of governmental power; and that head which presents this unsightly aspect was the Imperial name, and the secular and sacred institutions which were supported under the shade of Imperial authority.

"His head" appears as wounded, in the very act of rising. The deadly wound cut across the civil and ecclesiastical power: but as may happen in a natural body, when a deadly wound is received, the parts may re-unite so badly, that there is not merely a cicatrix, or scar, which disfigures, but a distortion; so it is in this new aspect of society. The ecclesiastical power is rising into civil power, and its influence becoming the distinguishing feature of the era. The woman does not yet appear as a drunken harlot, governing the actions of the beast, but she is in process of arraying herself and preparing to vault into her seat. This takes place when the ecclesiastical system becomes formed into the Papal Head. But meantime the wound is being healed, and the ten horns have budded forth, and the ecclesiastical element, which distinguished the previous Imperial form of social organization from the Pagan, is seen to be more rampant in this new state of things; Churchmen become feudal lords, and the chief monarchs of State, and possess an influence beyond what they ever possessed before. The world wonders after the beast; and they worship the dragon which gave power to the beast; and there was given to him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies. Society, organized in this new form, in conjunct civil and religious powers, seems invincible;—who is able to make war with the beast? All whose names are not written in the Lamb's book of life worship the beast, being of their father the devil, who is the author of this state of things. But the saints read its character, as a devouring beast, blaspheming God, his name, and his sanctuary, and them that dwell in heaven.

At this time, although the Bishop of Rome was recognised as entitled to precedency over all others, he was not regarded as entitled to rule other patriarchates. His position in one of the horns of the head, his influence in one of the ten kingdoms, did not exalt that horn over the rest. His precedency was not an enforced, but conventional precedency. Still, he was the recognised Coryphæus of that corrupt religion which now formed the cement of society, and healing medicament of the wounded head. And it is, as we think, on this account that the period of forty months is mentioned in this vision, when the foundation of the claims of Rome were laid, rather than in the next vision, when the usurpation and even concentration of all spiritual authority are exhibited as consolidated in the Papacy. And, inasmuch as there was a unity and sympathy in the spiritual usurpation which prevailed in all the kingdoms, it is already spoken of as the one wicked, in opposition to the "one new man," as the true Church is described in Eph. iii. 15.

As our object is to state with as much brevity as is consistent with intelli-

Digitized by Google

gibility, simply what we conceive to be shadowed forth in each vision, we forbear dwelling on other considerations which are calculated to confirm the view which we have given. We pass, therefore, to the lamb-like beast in the second vision, which we consider to refer to the Papacy, or the Papal Antichrist, as distinguished from the politico-ecclesiastical Antichrist which preceded its rise.

This beast is said to rise out of the earth, and not out of the sea, which we are disposed to regard as a prediction of the rise of the Bishop of Rome to supremacy over his brother hierarchs, by a slow, imperceptible, but steady progress, after the ecclesiastical system of the empire seemed to have been consolidated. He rises, claiming to be the Vicar of Christ, the Lamb of God; but he spake as a dragon, devouring the rights and privileges of his fellows. His look was stouter than that of his fellows. It was not the interest of bishops and patriarchs at first to acknowledge the Papal claims; but gradually on one pretext, or by one method and another, the Bishop of Rome comes to be recognised as the universal Bishop, and wields a sceptre and dominion in the West, more profoundly respected and cordially submitted to, from the terrible nature of his authority over both worlds, than ever were the sceptres and power of the Cæsars. *He exercises all the power* of the first beast before him; he makes the entire powers which were ever arrogated under the preceding ecclesiastical system, to centre in himself; and by concentrating he augments their strength.

This earth-sprung bestial power persuades the world not to revive, or, rather, restore, the former wounded beast, or the politico-ecclesiastical system of the empire, before it received its wound—to make an image of it, by conceding to himself a loftier ecclesiastical supremacy, to which the civil element should be subordinate. By his spiritual pretensions, he had power to give life to this reflection or image of imperial power, and to cause all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive the badge of servitude and subjection to his authority.

Ranke, speaking of the state of society at the Reformation, says: "The established order of things in Europe was, in fact, the same military sacerdotal state which had arisen in the eighth and ninth centuries, notwithstanding all the changes which had been introduced, had remained always essentially the same, compounded of the same fundamental elements. Nay, those very changes had generally been favourable to the sacerdotal element, whose commanding position had enabled it to pervade every form of public and private life, and every vein of intellectual culture. . . . . The civil authorities felt, at every moment, the indissoluble nature of their connexion with the hierarchy, and generally made themselves the instrument of the persecution of all who dissented from the faith prescribed by the Church; without political changes, separation from the hierarchy was impossible." What a comment are these sentences on this vision of the second beast, or the *Latin* man, whose number is given!

In order to admit of the rise of the Papacy, a certain state of society was requisite. The state of the world presented a *let* to it, when the Epistles to the Thessalonians were written. The feudal system has been regarded, and, we think justly, as having saved Europe from the danger of a universal monarchy. It was a state of anarchy, as Hallam says, the natural result of a vast and barbarous empire feebly administered. But such a state of things admitted of the rise of the Papacy, from the cohesive tendency of a corrupt Christianity in the midst of mutually jealous and repellent powers. In a period when, from the existence of a multitude of small dominions, there was inherent strength nowhere, the Bishop of Rome had the opportunity, and was led, by solicitation of the weak, as well as by ambition, to interpose between conflicting interests, so as, at last, to find himself invested with powers which no forethought could have aimed at obtaining. He thus rose out of the earth, which in other respects helped the woman; for the invasion of the Goths, which relieved the Church from the Arian persecution, was the preparation and pedestal for the elevation of the Papacy. He was able to deceive them that dwelt on the earth by means of those miracles which he had power, in the circumstances, to do; so that they agreed to make in him an image of the Imperial beast.

If we suppose that chap. xvii. relates to the visions of this chapter, the inter-

Digitized by Google

pretation which we have given meets the intricacy of the 10th and 11th verses. There are seven kings; five are fallen, and one—the sixth, or imperial Pagan form—is. The other, the politico-Ecclesiastical, as it existed between the overthrow of the empire, and the rise of the Papal supremacy, it is said, *is not yet come;* and, when he cometh, that state of society must continue a short space; and the beast that was, as we take it,—this intervening system, in which the Bishop of Rome had a recognised precedency before the establishment of the Papacy, and which existed for a little as the seventh form—he is the eighth, while as possessing the primacy of Rome, he was or is of the seventh. The seventh form is not described, unless it be described in the first vision of chap. xiii., and, according to the view which we advocate, it could not be more accurately described than by saying that the eighth is of the seventh.

We can imagine several objections which might be urged to the views of these visions which we have stated; but as we conceive that we could satisfactorily obviate their force, we leave our statement to the consideration of such as take an interest in inquiries of this kind, merely adding, that we have no such predilection in favour of the interpretation which we have given as shall hinder us from abandoning it, if insuperable objections be stated against it.

J. G.

REVELATION XVII. 11.

" And the beast that was and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition."

To the Editor of the " Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

THERE is a difficulty in the verse above quoted, Mr. Editor, which has generally, by Commentators, been passed over without any satisfactory explanation. It is stated in the words before us, that " The beast that was and is not, even he is the eighth," *i.e.*, *the beast* is to be the future head of *the beast—the beast*, in other words, is to be *its own head.*

In order to the clear understanding of the passage, our first inquiry should be what we are to understand by the Beast? Is it a worldly power, or an individual?

It would appear that, by this term, allusion is made to the *Roman Empire*, the fourth beast of Daniel, first described in the Apocalypse by *a great red dragon*, but identified with the Roman power by his seven heads and ten horns; and with the early form of that power by his heads being crowned, but not (at that time) his horns. In the 13th chapter, St. John perceives a beast, the same evidently by his having, as the other, seven heads and ten horns, only in a different aspect. He is said to arise out of the sea, or tumultuous state of the Roman Empire, and to take the place of the dragon; for he gives him his power, his seal, and great authority. His horns are now crowned, and on his heads there is the name of Blasphemy. We cannot, I think, mistake, on reading the description of this beast, in identifying it with the Papal Hierarchy, with the seal, and power, and authority of Pagan Rome, and rising to pre-eminence amidst its commotions. In this chapter we have the same seven-headed and tenhorned beast described, but with its horns uncrowned, and *ridden* by a woman, whose description is so clearly given, that none, we should imagine, *but Papists* can fail to discover a delineation of the Papacy. As to the enigma contained in the words, " The beast that was and is not," there may be two ways of explaining it, both being true in relation to the beast. In the text, when its last *coming* head is spoken of, the apostle describes him as "the beast that was and is not;" but when he sees him in his last form (in vision), and the world wondering at the beast, he speaks of him as the beast that was and is not, and YET IS. So that we may presume him to mean the same beast that was in one form, ceased to exist in that form, and appeared in another, and afterwards appeared again in a third; but all the while it was one and the same beast. We may understand, then, by this enigma, that the Roman Empire or power *was*, as Rome Pagan *was not* in that sense and character as Rome Papal, but will be again in another character, perhaps as Infidel Rome with the woman, or the

Digitized by Google

Papacy bestriding the beast; or, we may understand (if we confine our idea to the *temporal* power of Rome) the enigma to mean that the ten kingdoms existed with an imperial or other head, as the Roman Empire. They are *now* without a head as the ten kingdoms merely, but will again appear *with a head*, and manifest themselves as the same united Roman beast; for they will all agree to give their power and kingdom to the beast, till the words of God be *completed or fulfilled.*

The beast, then, in whichever way we unravel the enigma, means the Roman Empire, or power temporal (not Papal), the term as used in the text cannot have reference to the Papacy; such an interpretation (inasmuch as the woman appears ruling or guiding the beast) would make the Papacy to be ruling over the Papacy, and would introduce confusion; but the beast is said, in the verse we are considering, to be its own head, which I presume may be thus explained. In the last stage or form of the Roman Empire, the ten kings, or horns, being uncrowned, we apprehend its revolutionary or republican state to be prefigured; if so, in such a form, the *real* power will be concentrated in the people, the *sovereign* people; and so the beast itself will be the governing power or head; but it is said of this last head that it is to be of the seven. By the term *head*, St. John evidently means *form* of government. By a comparison of the 18th and 9th verses of the chapter, we shall find that both the woman and the beast are identified with Rome; and of Rome, he says when he saw the vision, that of its heads five had fallen. If this declaration be supposed to refer to its Emperors, it would not be fact, more than five having then fallen; but if it be supposed to refer to forms of government it would be true, five having passed away when the apostle wrote, viz., Kings, Consuls, Dictators, Decemvirs, and Military Tribunes with the authority of Consuls. One existed when the apostle wrote, viz., that of Emperors. This form continued either in the eastern or western branches of the empire until Buonaparte abolished the Imperial form, and constituted a new one in his own person, under the title of Protector of the Confederation of the Rhine. Of this seventh head it is predicated that it should continue but a short space, which we know to be the fact; and we now look for the re-appearance of a head, which is to be the eighth, and of the character of one of the preceding; though, therefore, we presume that the beast, or Roman power, in its last republican form, will virtually be the last head; yet we must presume also, from the observation, that it is to be of the seven, that that republican government will assume a form and character of one of the seven preceding; and as St. John, in vision, sees the woman, or the Papacy, bestriding the beast in its last form, it seems not improbable but that the Pope himself, under one of the seven titles before mentioned, may be the *nominal* head; and the signs of the times begin indeed to favour such an idea. But however this may be, and whoever may be the nominal head of the last Infidel republican beast, we have to thank God for the intimation given us by his Apostle John, that he will soon go into perdition. If, Mr. Editor, you consider the above remarks likely to be useful to the Church, bearing as they do an aspect towards our own times, perhaps you will find a place for them in your next number.

I am, your obedient servant,

JOHN PHILLIPS GURNEY.

Great Caufield Vicarage, by Dunmow, Essex.

---

2 PETER III.

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

DEAR SIR,—St. Peter himself, in his Second Epistle, says, that there are some things relating to the coming . . . of *our Lord*, and of *the day of God*, which are hard to be understood. His third chapter is an instance; for therein it is foretold that our present material system of heaven and earth shall be "dissolved" (not annihilated) by a flood of fire, no less extensive than the old flood of water. The time when this shall occur he calls the *day of God;* but whether it

Digitized by Google

shall occur immediately at the first *coming of our Lord*, or long after, is hard to be understood.

I. First, let it be observed how this difficulty arises. It turns upon the clause, ver. 13, "according to his promise." For, read over the chapter, omitting that clause, and no one will ever think of disputing but that the universal conflagration is to occur absolutely at the end of our present material system, and is to be succeeded immediately by an entire new system, rising out of the dissolution of its predecessor. But that clause cannot be omitted, and the question arises, To what promise does it refer? There are but two prophecies to which it can refer,—either to Isa. lxv., lxvi., or to Rev. xxi. 1. But the Revelation was not yet given when St. Peter wrote, and therefore the prophecy to which he refers must be that of Isaiah.

Here, however, it is worth observing, that had the reference been to the Revelation, we should have been met by no difficulty whatever; for in that prophecy the new heavens and earth succeed immediately *after fire* comes down from God out of heaven, and absolutely at the end of our present system; just as, *primâ facie* at least, it appears to do in St. Peter. The order stands thus:—*After the* 1000 *years* (1.) Satan is loosed. (2.) The nations are confederate. (3.) Fire comes down upon them from heaven (the last conflagration certainly), the deceiver *at the same time* being cast into the lake; heaven and earth fleeing away, and both sea and land rendering up their dead to judgment. (4.) A new heavens and earth; death is for ever destroyed, and the sea is no more.

However, being referred to Isaiah, there we find, from the whole context, that the new heavens and earth of that prophecy cannot possibly occur *after the* 1000 *years*. For instance, death is not yet destroyed, "for the child shall die." (lxv. 20.) Nor is the sea yet dried up; for it is after the Lord shall have come with fire, that those who escape shall be sent "to the isles afar off" (lxvi. 19), which isles, however you interpret them, must imply a sea; and thus, to reconcile St. Peter with his own reference is precisely the difficulty.

II. Secondly, then, for the solution of this, let it be observed, that the prophet and apostle both agree in these statements; (1.) That the Lord will come; (2.) That there will be fire and a conflagration; (3.) That there shall be a new heavens and earth. Of these in order:—

1. *The coming of the Lord.*—St. Peter iii. 4, and Isa. lxvi. 15, both mention this. The coming of the Lord, if it be literal and personal, will be once for all. Now, that it is *literal and personal* in St. Peter is disputed by none. But by some it is contended that in Isaiah it is *figurative and providential.* They allow, however, that the literal sense ought not to be abandoned without necessity; much less ought the prophet and the apostle to be confronted, except very good reason can be given. The only dispute is about this reason and necessity. We shall see—

2. *The Conflagration.*—St. Peter confessedly foretels an universal *conflagration*. Isaiah, thrice in two verses, lxvi. 15, 16, reiterates that the coming of our Lord shall be with *fire*. Now it is contended *by some*, that this fire in Isaiah cannot be that universal conflagration in St. Peter, for this reason, because such a conflagration as in St. Peter could not possibly leave alive behind it the seed of such a blessed population as is described by Isaiah. *By others* it is answered, that such a seed may be saved alive by miracle, or even by other means, after the example of Noah's ark. Certainly, this answer is sound, and, if it were needed, applicable even to the universal conflagration; but it is not needed, and instead of such an answer, it ought to be conceded that the *fire* foretold by Isaiah is a partial one, and not the universal *conflagration*. What should hinder?

For first, it is at least conceivable, that the flaming fire which the Lord *at his coming* (his literal and personal coming) shall cast upon his enemies, gathered from all nations to Armageddon, may extend no farther than to his own "Immanuel's land;" whether strictly the land of Judah, or largely as far as to the Euphrates. Suppose such a case, and to that indeed let the argument be applied, that, whether by miracle or by other means, a remnant even there shall be preserved; and in such a case, the population of the earth of course would remain in general unscathed.

Digitized by Google

Next, let it be observed, that such a limitation of the fire in Isaiah would perfectly harmonize his prophecy (as to this point) with St. Peter's, of a general conflagration. For St. Peter does not say that the universal conflagration will occur immediately and simultaneously with the very coming of our Lord. St. Peter says, v. 7, That the heaven and earth which are now, are stored with fire (as the old with water), being reserved, not for the coming of the Lord, but for *the day* of judgment, and of the perdition of impious men. And again, v. 10, *The day* of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, *in which* day, &c. And a third time, v. 13, Looking for, and eager for, the coming of *the day* of God, *in which* the heavens being on fire, &c.

Lastly, it is not indeed to be inferred from the intervening ninth verse (a thousand years are *as one day*) that the apostle, anticipating the Apocalypse, affirms that a thousand years with the Lord *are one day*. No, there he is only affirming the difference between man's estimation of time and the Lord's. Nevertheless, the apostle's remark may very opportunely remind us, that in the language of the Spirit, and, indeed, in all languages, this word "day" frequently involves a large sense, and so it may here. Adopt, then, *with the addition of one word*, the following passage from Mede, p. 603: "The thousand years are that *great day of the Lord* so much celebrated by the Jews in all their writings, and taken up by our Lord and his apostles: not a day of a few hours, but a continued space of many years, wherein Christ shall destroy all his enemies, beginning with Antichrist *by his revelation from heaven in flaming fire*, and ending with the universal [*conflagration and*] resurrection." And why not? Let us see farther.

3. *A new heaven and earth.*—These are predicted both by the prophet and the apostle; and here two questions are to be answered: (1) Do they both speak of a new system in the same sense, *i. e.*, in the sense of a new material system? St. Peter necessarily, from his context, speaks of a literal, and not a figurative system. *Primâ facie*, therefore, he interprets for us, that it is a literal system, *i. e.*, a material system in the prophecy to which he refers. Even without such suggestion, the literal sense ought not to be abandoned without necessity. Now, there is no such necessity here; for, as it is conceivable that the fire of the Lord at his personal coming may be restricted within the limits of Immanuel's land; so, also, it is certainly conceivable that the same Almighty Lord who shall bring an entire new system out of the dissolution of the old one, can first bring a partial new system out of the dissolution of Immanuel's land and skies. But, granting this (2), How will St. Peter's expectation of an entire new system be justified by his own reference, if it be thus interpreted, as of a partial new system? Perfectly; because that promise to Jerusalem was, that her new system "shall remain *before me*, saith the Lord" (lxvi. 22); that is, for ever. "Be ye glad and rejoice *for ever* in that which I create." (lxv. 18.) For, if that partial new system is to remain for ever, then the entire old system of which (by the hypothesis) that will still form a part—however expurgated it may be (with the exception of that part) by a similar baptism of fire—needs must also remain for ever. And hence, by this hypothesis, the actual accomplishment of such a standing physical renovation of Immanuel's land and skies throughout the thousand years will be; and even the promise of it to St. Peter was, and to the intelligent believer still is, our sure pledge to expect at last an entire "new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."

I have only to add, that, having entertained this view of the subject for many years, I am of course confirmed in it myself; and I believe that if others adopt it for trial they will find, that it not only reconciles the prophecies of Peter and John with that of Isaiah referred to, but it also illustrates several other prophecies which expressly describe Immanuel's land to its widest extent as a perfect paradise, under his millennial, as well as his eternal, reign; or, in another phrase, both during the great day of judgment and for ever. In a word, it should seem plain that our entire world, whether considered as material or moral, is not to be perfectly renovated all at once, immediately after the coming of our Lord, but extensively then, and completely at another period, namely, after the thousand years. I am, &c.,

Landford, Wilts, Jan. 22, 1849. HENRY GIRDLESTONE.

Digitized by Google

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

Manchester, Jan. 22, 1849.

Sir,—It is with much pleasure and satisfaction that I hail the appearance of your "Prophetic Journal." It is both timely and appropriate; and the high character and standing of your conductors and contributors will be an effectual security for the value of those principles and sentiments which will be maintained and advocated. You will not only direct attention "to the blessed hope, even the glorious appearing of our Lord and Saviour," but you will also "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," in all its primitive simplicity and integrity.

I wish to make a few remarks upon the subject-matter in question between yourself and that eminent student of prophecy, Mr. Faber, in your January number. While I cannot admit the slightest doubt with regard to the *pre*-millennial advent of Christ, yet I do think that the general conflagration of 2 Peter iii. may probably be *post*-millennial. The "day of the Lord" alluded to in that chapter seems to include the whole millennial period. In the tenth verse, it is said, concerning the day of the Lord *in the which* "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise," &c. This mode of expression may, with equal propriety, have reference to the termination of the day of the Lord, as to its commencement.

Again, in the twelfth verse, the word "*wherein*" is of a contingent, and not of a positive character. The exact time seems to remain undetermined. With regard also to the new heavens and new earth of Isaiah, when compared with the prophecy of Peter, it *may be* that the two periods are synchronous; but still the conclusion that they are so partakes more of assumption than of actual proof.

And we have no prophetic information concerning any miraculous preservation of any large portion of the earth's inhabitants during that awful period. Those difficulties disappear by deferring the conflagration to the last and general judgment, at the close of the Millennium. Or there may be a partial, or local, purification by fire (2 Thess. i. 8), at the time of the advent, the change or transformation being more universal and decisive at the subsequent period. If this point can be satisfactorily cleared up, and shown to be confined in its application to those events and circumstances which will transpire at the close of the present dispensation, then a great and important point will be permanently established. And until this object can be established, the very advent itself, as introductory to the millennial kingdom, will for ever remain an open question. Or it will be controverted and disputed, until the day of its own glorious manifestation.

As the first coming of Christ, with his adorable and expiatory sacrifice, presents an object upon which our *faith* can rest continually; so his second coming, in power and great glory, is, in like manner, the great object of our *hope*, and of our earnest anticipation and desire—the one being introductory to the kingdom of grace—the other to the kingdom of everlasting glory. And around both of them all prophecy and all promise do revolve and concentre.

No rational doubt can be entertained in the minds of those who are capable of examining scriptural evidence, or the heart to yield to such evidence, that the immortal and heavenly kingdom is at hand, and that the Lord thereof is now about to "take unto himself his great power, and reign." Requesting the insertion of this letter in your "Journal of Prophecy," with editorial comments and reply,

I remain, Sir, very truly yours,

A Student of Prophecy.

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

Sir,—As a student of the Apocalypse, I can have no hesitation in subscribing to the general truth of the remarks made by your Correspondent, Mr. James

Digitized by Google

Hatley Frere, in the October number.* It was undoubtedly the close observation of synchronical passages which first led the celebrated Mede to his improved scheme of Apocalyptic interpretation. And the same inductive principle, irrespective of any particular sense of the successive parts of the prophecy, has proved, in the hands of subsequent writers, an important instrument for the discovery of new truths. Yet Mr. Frere himself would hardly affirm, that all of Mede's synchronisms, founded on that principle in theory, were fully to be maintained in fact. Surely, then, it is too much if he expects the same in his own case.

He asks to be informed "whether any commentator who has written since 1826, when these and other texts of a like nature" (alluding especially to Rev. xix. 9; xxi. 5; xxii. 6, &c.) "were fully brought before them, has, in any edition of his works which I may have overlooked, noticed these texts?" It is possible Mr. Frere overlooked a notice of his own pamphlet on the *Great Continental Revolution*, in the "Church of England Quarterly Review" for last July. I beg to refer him to a work "published since 1826," the title of which he will find prefixed to the same article,† and where the texts he mentions are very specially noticed, though a somewhat different account given of a parallelism which could hardly have escaped the observation of the attentive reader.

I am, Sir, faithfully yours,

London, Feb. 5, 1849. VERAX.

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

Teignmouth, February 10, 1849.

SIR,—I know not whether you have ever seen a map of the Land of Promise, showing its divisions according to the prophecy of Ezekiel, chap. xlv.—xlviii., with explanatory observations, by Richard Palmer. Nisbet, 1832. I should like, through the medium of your Journal, to draw the attention of students of prophecy to this map, which I believe is out of print, but which I think deserves to be reprinted, with any slight corrections which our increased knowledge of the geography of the Holy Land, since the time it was published, may render desirable. Such a map would materially assist in the study of the latter chapters of Ezekiel, and now that unfulfilled prophecy is receiving so much and such increasing attention from the Lord's people, a sufficiently remunerative sale might probably be looked for by whoever undertook to reproduce it. The very first glance at it would present what would most likely be new and interesting to many who have not much considered the details of this portion of Scripture, —perhaps not so much even as to be aware, that the future temple will be situated, not in Jerusalem itself, but about thirty miles to the north of it; so that the waters mentioned in chap. xlvii. are not the same as those spoken of in Zech. xiv. 8, which latter will flow from the *city*, but are identical with the fountain that shall come forth of the house of the Lord, mentioned by Joel iii. 18. Mr. Palmer, in common I believe with many (and I suppose correctly), understands by the River of Egypt, (Num. xxxiv. 5,) not the Nile, but the stream called anciently Rhinocorura, but now Wady-el-Arish. The principles that guided him in the construction of the map are detached in the explanatory observations which accompany it, and in which Scripture seems to have been carefully and accurately followed.

Permit me, in conclusion, to express the gratification afforded me by the appearance of your Journal, and the width and catholicity of its basis; and my hope that the fair and open field it offers for amicable discussion may tend to the elucidation of the important department of God's truth to which it is devoted, and the glory of his name.

I am, Sir, very truly yours,

GEORGE J. WALKER.

* See p. 101, Correspondence.

† "The Harmony of the Apocalypse with other Prophecies of Holy Scripture." By the Rev. W. H. Hoare, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Digitized by Google

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

Sir,—May I ask the favour of your allowing me a small space in one of your pages, in order to my bringing before the eyes of such of your readers as may possess a copy of my "Vindiciæ Horariæ," a mistake which I have inadvertently made at page 245. In the second paragraph of note 3, on that page, I have mixed up notices from two letters of Pope Leo that follow each other in Raynoldus, the one to the Cardinal Thomas Strigoniensis, the other to King Wladislas of Bohemia, as if altogether belonging to the latter. It is in fact to the Cardinal, not to the King, that the Pope writes about the Bohemian heretics, "ab unitate ecclesiæ deviantes." My manuscript extracts, made at Rome last March, did not mark the distinction, and in the interval I had forgotten it.

Let me notice, also, the errata of ημερουσιον, for ἑμεροτροφις, at page 19 ; of *injury*, for *inquiry*, at page 71 ; and *Schmidt*, for *Smith*, at page 110.

I remain, Sir, with best wishes for the success of your periodical,

Yours faithfully,

E. B. Elliott.

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

Sir,—In what you have so justly advanced in your refutation of the assertion, that *literal* Babylon is to be rebuilt, it appears to me, that the words, "*which reigneth*," (Rev. xvii. 18,) are entirely overlooked.

I take the liberty of pointing this out, and also beg to state, that when the subject was advanced by a friend of mine who attends a chapel at Pimlico, I naturally enough referred to the prophecies of the destruction of Babylon, where *it is written* (Isaiah xiii. 17), that the *Medes* shall destroy it, and (20th verse) "It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation." (See also Jer. l. 39.) If in defiance of these prophecies it shall still be asserted that *literal*, not mystical Babylon (Rev. xvii. 5, "Mystery") is to be rebuilt, it also involves raising of "the kingdoms of Ararat, Minni, and Ashchenaz," (Jer. li. 27), because after the destruction of Babylon by the latter and the Medes, "they shall not take a stone for a corner, nor for a foundation, but Babylon shall be desolate for ever." (Jer. li. 26.) What will all this lead to ?

I remain, Sir, yours faithfully,

December 2, 1848. An earnest inquirer.

A LITTLE WHILE.

"The time is short ; it remaineth that they that weep be as though they wept not, and they that rejoice as though they rejoiced not."—1 Cor. vii. 29.

I.

Beyond the smiling and the weeping
I shall be soon ;
Beyond the waking and the sleeping,
Beyond the sowing and the reaping,
I shall be soon.
Love, rest, and home !
Sweet hope !
Lord, tarry not, but come.

Digitized by Google

II.

Beyond the blooming and the fading
I shall be soon;
Beyond the shining and the shading,
Beyond the hoping and the dreading,
I shall be soon.
Love, rest, and home!
Sweet hope!
Lord, tarry not, but come.

III.

Beyond the rising and the setting
I shall be soon;
Beyond the soothing and the fretting,
Beyond remembering and forgetting,
I shall be soon.
Love, rest, and home!
Sweet hope!
Lord, tarry not, but come.

IV.

Beyond the gathering and the strowing
I shall be soon;
Beyond the ebbing and the flowing,
Beyond the coming and the going,
I shall be soon.
Love, rest, and home!
Sweet hope!
Lord, tarry not, but come.

V.

Beyond the parting and the meeting
I shall be soon.
Beyond the farewell and the greeting,
Heart fainting now, and now high-beating,
I shall be soon.
Love, rest, and home!
Sweet hope!
Lord, tarry not, but come.

VI.

Beyond the frost-chain and the fever
I shall be soon;
Beyond the rock-waste and the river,
Beyond the ever and the never,
I shall be soon.
Love, rest, and home!
Sweet hope!
Lord, tarry not, but come.

NOTICE.

We have to request contributors to study brevity in their communications, and also to transmit them early in the quarter. Several communications have arrived too late for insertion. We do not require poetical contributions.

All readers of the Journal are most earnestly besought to give it room in their prayers; that by means of it God may be honoured and his truth advanced; also, that it may be conducted in faith and love, with sobriety of judgment and discernment of the truth, in nothing carried away into error, or hasty speech, or sharp unbrotherly disputation.

ERRATUM.—Page 231, line 17 from foot, for *past* read *post*.

Macintosh, Printer, Great New-street, London.

Digitized by Google

THE QUARTERLY

JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

JULY, 1849.

Art. I.—THE PROPHETIC BLESSINGS OF JACOB AND MOSES.*

That Israel after the flesh was, in many respects, typical of the Church of God is universally admitted. Its history, whether in Egypt, in the wilderness, or in the Land of Promise, is an unfailing source whence parallels and analogies, as well as contrasts, are wont to be drawn with our present state. Together with a brief examination of the literal sense of the prophecies in Gen. xlix. and Deut. xxxiii., it is proposed in this paper to follow out the familiar idea of the typical bearing of Jewish circumstances on those of the Christian Church, with reference to the principle of diversity in unity. Speaking of the events connected with the exodus and the wilderness, the apostle says, "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples; and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the ages are come." (1 Cor. x. 11.) And it would not appear unlikely that, in the special and characteristic *features* of the different tribes, there should be discovered some of those instructive analogies which abound in the history of the nation as a whole.

In all essential points, as integral parts of the δωδεκάφυλον (Acts xxvi. 7), each tribe, and each member of a tribe, was as much alike as are Christians now, compare, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. x. 1—4, and Eph. iv. 4—6; and the parallel, as far as relates to unity, is too obvious to require further allusion. A compendious view of the tribal diversities in Israel has been afforded us by the Holy Spirit in the two remarkable chapters

* Gen. xlix.; Deut. xxxiii.

Digitized by Google

which will now be considered, 1. In their primary and literal reference to the natural Israel; and 2. As illustrative of varieties of moral character in the Israel of God.

Before, however, proceeding to the examination in this twofold point of view of the prophetic blessings of Jacob and of Moses, it may be well to advert to the origin and significancy of the names themselves of the twelve Patriarchs.

Though accompanied with a mixture of human infirmity, yet a godly spirit manifestly influenced the two mothers who built the house of Israel, and led them to bestow names on their sons which should serve as perpetual memorials of the goodness of the Lord, or embody the notion of some quality or principle characteristic of those who serve him. The meaning of the names is very carefully given in the sacred narrative, and the ideas conveyed may thus be stated:—

REUBEN; *See a son.*—The kindness of the Lord in looking upon our affliction.

SIMEON; *Hearing.*—The ear of the Lord hearkens to our complaints.

LEVI; *Joining.*—Union in affection of the Lord's people.

JUDAH; *Praised.*—Motive and provision for praising the Lord.

DAN; *A judge.*—God's judgment and vindication of our cause.

NAPTHALI; *My wrestling.*—Power to prevail by prayer and faith.

GAD; *Fortune.**—Prosperity from God.

ASHER; *Happy.*—Happiness from God.

ISSACHAR; *He is wages.*—God's recompense of our works.

ZEBULUN; *Dwelling.*—Fellowship among God's people.

JOSEPH; *He will add.*†—Hope in the Lord.

BENJAMIN; *Son of the right hand.*—Faith triumphant in sorrow.‡

* בְּגָד, or, according to the Masoretic reading, בָּא גָד, Gen. xxx. 11, seems to mean, "*fortune has come,*" LXX., *ἐν τύχῃ*, Vul., *feliciter*. This sense of "Gad" is given by Gesenius and Rosenmüller.

† In Joseph (Gen. xxx. 23, 24) there may be, as Gesenius says (Heb. Lex., s. v.), "allusion to a double etymology, as though it were, 1. יֹאסֵף, *he takes away*, and 2. יֹסֵף, *he shall add.*

‡ We may gather this as the general notion contained in the Word, from Gen. xxxv. 17, 18. It is the province of faith to look beyond the sorrowful present, and to see in a Ben-oni, the son of my sorrow, a Bin-ya-min, the son of my right hand. The despondency of sinking nature in the dying Rachel had chosen a name that would have imparted an undesirable celebrity and permanency to feelings that faith dispels.

Digitized by Google

We may likewise here notice the sons of Joseph :—

MANASSEH ; *Who makes forget.*—Divine comfort abounding over our trials.

EPHRAIM ; *Doubly fruitful.*—Affliction overruled for rich blessing.

These names, suggestive of so many precious considerations, may not unlikely have often ministered to the instruction and the comfort of the pious and thoughtful among the descendants of the patriarchs; and their *moral,* so to speak, is not less applicable to the "Israel of God," the "household of faith," at present. They may remind us of the heavenly kindness that is the balm of the bitterest sorrow; of the faith and hope that sustain us under the heaviest trials and most adverse circumstances; of the condescension that rewards our imperfect services; of the full cup of joy which is our own proper portion; of the sacrifice of praise that we are continually enabled to offer; and of the bonds which unite all to whom these things apply.

It is altogether unlikely that the minuteness with which the Biblical history details the circumstances that led to the choice of these names should be devoid of some spiritual instruction, bearing upon other times and other scenes. A striking instance of a transaction seemingly of a purely domestic character, serving as an envelope for important truth deduced from it, two thousand years after, is presented in Gen. xxi. (Compare Gal. iv. 22—31.) And we know besides that the memorial of these names will pass into eternity. Whatever else may be conveyed by it, the splendid distinction belongs to the twelve tribes of Israel, that their names are written on the twelve gates of pearl of the heavenly city. (Rev. xxi. 12.) It may be inferred, therefore, that the ideas associated with them must be equally perpetuated; and that, in the counsel of God, both were, from the beginning, so devised as to deserve an imperishable record amidst heavenly glories.

We will now proceed to the consideration of the Scriptures above alluded to. The patriarch's simple preface contrasts with the grandeur of the introduction to the blessings of Moses. They may be introduced here in order to present a complete version of both prophecies.

Gather yourselves together, and hear, ye sons of Jacob;
And hearken unto Israel your father. (Gen. xlix. 2.)

Jacob's trust in God rose above the deep sorrow of the hour, and prevented so inauspicious a name from being for ever attached to one of the tribes of Israel.

Digitized by Google

2 Jehovah from Sinai came,
And rose from Seir unto them;
He shined forth from Mount Paran,
And came from myriads of holy ones:
From his right hand (went) a fiery law for them.
3 Yea, he loved the people;
All his saints (are) in thy hand;
And they lay down at thy feet:
(Every one) receives of thy words.
4 Moses commanded us a law,
The inheritance of the congregation of Jacob.
5 And he was in Jeshurun a king,
At the assembling of themselves of the heads of the people,
(At the assembling of themselves) together, of the tribes of Israel. (Deut. xxxiii. 2—5.)

Verse 2 (compare Jud. v. 5; Ps. lxviii. 8; Hab. iii. 3) alludes to the sublime tempest that accompanied the Lord's progress from Seir, where he *arose*, by Paran (the intermediate station), where he *shined forth*, until finally the awful glory settled upon Mount Sinai. The Lord is said to have come *from* Sinai, although the Divine presence does not appear to have moved from the top of the mountain during this scene. It is probably to be understood in a looser sense of the fearful manifestations which proceeded from the mount, even as it is said that the people were brought forth out of the camp "to *meet with* God." (Exod. xix. 17.) In the same sense may be taken מֵרִבְבֹת קֹדֶשׁ, of which "*with* ten thousands," &c., is a questionable rendering. These are the angels who were with Jehovah on Sinai (Ps. lxviii. 17; Acts vii. 53; Gal. iii. 19), and *from whom* he is said to have come by a kind of latitude of expression. Verse 3 refers to Israel at the foot of Mount Sinai, receiving the law that was to be their inheritance. (Ver. 4.)

Reuben is thus addressed by his father:—

3 Reuben, my firstborn (art) thou,
My might, and the beginning of my strength;
The excellency of dignity and the excellency of power.
4 Wanton as water, thou shalt not excel;
Because thou wentest up to thy father's bed;
Then defiledst thou (it): to my couch he went up. (Gen. xlix. 3, 4.)

And his descendants in a few short but expressive words by Moses:—

Digitized by Google

6 Let Reuben live, and not die;
But let his men be few.* (Deut. xxxiii. 6.)

The brilliant prospects of Jacob's firstborn were destroyed through his sin; and the history of his tribe verified the humble and obscure destiny to which it is here consigned. The seventh in population at the exodus, it had afterwards decreased so as to rank only as the ninth in numerical strength on entering Canaan. No eminent character ever sprang from Reuben. What should have been a star of the first magnitude barely twinkled in the firmament. By the sinful gratification of an hour were forfeited the blessings of ages. He never excelled, and his men were few.

The counterpart of Reuben, it is to be feared, is far from being uncommon in the Church of God. It is found in those whose spiritual advantages and privileges, and perhaps natural parts, seemed to hold out the fairest prospect of future excellence. But, in an evil hour, some temptation, or besetting sin, has nipped the promise in the bud; or the spirit of worldliness, in a slower, but equally sure way, has acted like a blight on the character. The faithfulness of a covenant God ensures, indeed, their safety. Like Reuben they live, and die not: but that is all. A bare vitality, devoid of healthful vigour,—a sickly, drooping existence, alone remain to them. The salt has lost its savour: the "excellency of dignity and the excellency of power" are gone for ever; and they often sink below the level of other Christians, who, if they never thought of aspiring to eminence, are at least free from the sin or folly that lost it to those in whom it might, and ought to, have been found.

Respecting the different order in which the tribes stand in the blessings of Jacob and Moses, it is easily seen that, in the former, priority of birth is mostly observed. In the latter, regard is had to the features of dignity, and the relative importance possessed by each. Reuben being the only exception, whose appearance at the head of the list in Moses' blessing only makes his case the more humiliating. In Gen. xlix., after the four first sons of Leah, come her other two, Zebulun and Issachar (why Zebulun comes first is uncertain, unless it may be inferred, from chap. xxx. 20, to be a tribute of affection to the memory of Leah); then the two firstborn of Bilhah and Zilpah respectively; then their two younger sons, of whom Asher, perhaps, as the son of *Leah's* maid, is set before Napthali; lastly, Joseph and Ben-

* So Vulgate renders, and the Italian and French versions of Diodati and Main.

jamin. In Deut. xxxiii., the first four names after Reuben manifestly come in appropriate order with respect to points of distinction and importance either then or subsequently belonging to them; and the arrangement of the remaining six, varying from Gen. xlix. only by placing Gad before Dan and Napthali before Asher, appears to have been made very much on the same principle. But it is not worth while to enter upon this more at large.

Simeon, who is associated with his brother in Gen. xlix., is entirely passed over by Moses. This is not surprising, considering that the tribe was the lowest of all in point of numbers on entering Palestine, and was never, at any time, more than an insignificant appendage to Judah (Josh. xix. 1—9); coming in like a parasite, as it were, for the over-abundance of the latter's portion, and almost merging into its glory an individuality that could boast of little more than the name. Thus, while the names of some of God's children are preserved in the *family* roll, they are wanting in the records wherein are chronicled the worthy deeds and various merits of others.

5 Simeon and Levi (are) brethren;
Weapons of violence (are) their swords.
6 Into their secret let not my soul come;
Unto their assembly let not mine honour be united:
For in their anger they slew men,
And in their self-will they houghed oxen.
7 Cursed (be) their anger, for it was fierce;
And their wrath, for it was grievous:
I will divide them in Jacob,
And I will scatter them in Israel. (Gen. xlix. 5—7.)

The penalty visited on the stormy passion and unsparing wrath of Simeon was not, as in the instance of Levi, modified by after-circumstances. He stands a warning to us against the indulgence, even under considerable provocation, of impetuous and wrathful feelings. Great as are the evils which they often occasion to others, they are frequently still more ruinous to their possessors. The family of God has often suffered through the heated minds and untempered, indiscriminating anger of such as have gone in the way of Simeon and Levi. "There is that speaketh like the piercings of a sword." (Prov. xii. 18.) "The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God" (Jas. i. 20); but it has sometimes caused a moral desolation as disastrous in its way as the spoiling of Shechem, and made the people of God, as then, "to stink among the inhabitants of the land." From

Digitized by Google

the emphatic words of the patriarch, language that often needs not softening, may still be borrowed for its condemnation; and from his sentence, as well as from the expressive silence of Moses, we may learn to how low a point in the scale of excellence it is possible to fall through the prevalence of unbridled passions. In the scattered and divided lot of Simeon we may see a parallel with the loss of moral power and eminence in those Christians who have resembled him in the reckless violence of his character.

But Levi, though he shared in his brother's sin, and in a certain way came under its consequences, obtained, nevertheless, a distinguished lot:—

8 And of Levi he said,
(Let) thy Thummim and thy Urim (be) to thy holy one;
Whom thou didst prove in Massah,
(And with) whom thou didst strive at the waters of Meribah.
9 Who said of his father and of his mother, I have not seen him;
And his brethren he did not acknowledge,
And his children he did not know:
For they have observed thy word,
And thy covenant have they kept.
10 They shall teach thy judgments to Jacob,
And thy law to Israel:
They shall put incense to thy nostrils,
And whole burnt-sacrifice upon thine altar.
11 Bless, O Jehovah, his substance,
And the work of his hands accept thou:
Smite on the loins them that rise against him,
And them that hate him, that they rise not again. (Deut. xxxiii. 8—11.)

Verse 8 seems to be a prayer that this special distinction of the priesthood, the Urim and Thummim, might not, despite of all failure (as at Meribah), be lost or forfeited, but ever remain with the Lord's holy one (לְאִישׁ חֲסִידֶךָ), *i. e.*, Aaron; who is called also, Ps. cvi. 16, the saint of the Lord (קְדוֹשׁ יְהוָה), evidently including, however, his descendants in the priesthood, although many of them were not personally חֲסִידִים. Exod. xvii. and Numb. xx. appear to be both here alluded to, although the part that Aaron specially had in the former is not recorded in the narrative. The Lord is here said to have strived with his holy one; which is readily understood, although the circumstance is conversely put in the narration. (Numb. xx. 13.) Verse 9

Digitized by Google

evidently relates to Exod. xxxii. 26—29, and the whole Levitical tribe is included in the statement. (See also Numb. xxv. 11—13; Mal. ii. 5, 6.)

The official distinctions of the Levitical tribe find their correspondence in the priestly office and dignity with which the blood of Jesus has now invested *every* true believer. (Rev. i. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 5—9, &c.) The Urim and Thummim are ever with Him in the heavenlies of whom Aaron was the type. Nor has any amount of corporate or individual failure touched the consecration of the priestly Christian family. Nevertheless, in the appreciation and practical use of the one common priesthood there are many diversities amongst Christians. A considerable amount of merely natural feelings mixes itself up with the service of some, and takes the place of that faithful and discriminating spiritual judgment and holy habit of mind which befit those who, whilst each moment, as new creatures, they are brought into contact with the holiness of God, are still linked by unredeemed bodies, and a carnal principle in their members, with the old creation, and exposed to its manifold defilements. A compromising, trimming spirit is the bane of modern Christianity. To the inroads of a growing worldliness, an intellectual scepticism, and a spurious liberality, it opposes nothing effectual. Christ should be followed, and his truth maintained, though not with the weapons, yet with the stern fidelity of the ancient Levites. Those with whom his Word and covenant are paramount above all other claims and considerations, are approved by him; they are fitted to teach his judgments to others, and to offer to him spiritual sacrifices. Possessed of the faithful spirit, they fill the place and enjoy the blessing of Levi.

8 Judah! thee thy brethren shall praise;
Thy hand (shall be) on the neck of thine enemies:
Thy father's children shall bow down before thee.
9 A lion's whelp (is) Judah;
From the prey, my son, thou art gone up:
He stooped down, he couched as a lion,
And as a lioness; who shall rouse him up?
10 The sceptre shall not depart from Judah,
Nor a lawgiver from between his feet,
Until Shiloh come;
And unto him (shall be) the obedience of the peoples.
11 Binding unto the vine his foal,
And unto the choice vine his ass's colt
He washed in wine his apparel,

Digitized by Google

And in the blood of grapes his garment.
12 His eyes (are) bright with wine,
And his teeth white with milk. (Gen. xlix. 8—12.)
7 And this (is the blessing) of Judah; and he said,
Hear, O Jehovah! the voice of Judah;
And unto his people bring him:
Let his hands contend for him;
And an help from his enemies be thou (to him.) (Deut. xxxiii. 7.)

Gen. xlix. 8, 9, describes the pre-eminence, both in peace and war, of this most distinguished tribe. Its points of superiority are too familiar to require more than a passing reference. Besides exceeding the rest in population, it took the lead in the wilderness, and in the wars of Canaan. (Numb. x. 14, Jud. i. 2.) From it sprang Othniel, the first of the judges, and the long line of kings from David to Christ. Its ample territory included the rich vineyards of Engedi, Sorek, and Eschol. The figure in ver. 9, is of a lion returning to his den, and lying down with the prey he has taken; in which verse we find from Rev. v. 5, that the Lord Jesus is also specially alluded to. The ass's colt being tied to the vine as to any common tree, and the apparel washed in wine instead of water, are expressive of luxuriant abundance. And if the verse be taken in connexion with the one before it, it may have a further and particular reference to the age of peace and abundance when Shiloh (the Peaceable one, or Peace-giver) shall reign; of which the era of Solomon (the Pacific) was typical. (1 Kings iv. 20—25; Ps. lxxii.) Some strong objections to the ordinary interpretation of v. 10 may be seen in the paper on "Shiloh—the King of Zion," in No. II. of this Journal.* Owing to the rejection of Shiloh by Israel, the last clause of v. 10 yet remains to be fulfilled, with many other prophecies concerning the kingdom of Christ. (Compare Isa. ix. 6, 7; xlix. 6—8; Ps. ii. 8—11, &c., &c.)

The majesty of power, royal dignity, and affluence—the characteristics of Judah, belong likewise to those who have been raised by the work of the Son of God to kingly as well as priestly honours. (Rev. xx. 4, 6; xxii. 5; 1 Pet. ii. 9, &c.) While the full enjoyment and realization of both are reserved for the heavenly state, a deportment becoming those who partake of such a lofty destiny is expected from them on

* It was gratifying to the writer to find that the view taken in this paper substantially corresponded with that which he had himself for some years entertained on this prophecy.

Digitized by Google

earth. There should be found in Christians a *royal* as well as a priestly habit of mind. They should exhibit largeness of heart, generosity, and a disdain for everything mean and unworthy. And in the service of God the lion's courage should be seen in them. The clusters of Sorek produced not the wine that brightens *their* eyes, and the milk *they* drink is better than that yielded by the flocks and herds which fed on the pastures of Judah. (Isa. lv. 1.) Conscious of their present abundant portion, and inspired with a sense of what awaits them, they should "walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they are called." Faith even now discerns the golden gleam of the crowns that shall encircle their brows, and leads them, as it were, to the very steps of the thrones placed for them in heaven. The vision of the glorious future, when not dimmed by unbelief, will animate them, as it may have done the sons of Judah, both in the wilderness and the land; who anticipated the time when the *shebet* of their prince would become the sceptre of Shiloh, and their tribal supremacy widen into universal domain. But some, much more than others, realize these things, and exhibit the characteristics of the royal tribe.

13 Zebulun by the shore of the sea shall dwell;
And he (shall be) by a shore of ships;
And his border (shall be) unto Zidon. (Gen. xlix. 13.)

18 And of Zebulun he said,
Rejoice, Zebulun, in thy going out;
And, Issachar, in thy tents.
19 The people unto the mountain shall they call;
There shall they offer sacrifices of righteousness;
For the abundance of the sea shall they suck,
And hidden treasures of the sand. (Deut. xxxiii. 18, 19.)

It is impossible now to discover what actual extent of sea-coast from Carmel northwards, was ever possessed by Zebulun. The words of Jacob certainly seem to imply more than that just a corner of its western boundary should reach to the sea; which, however, is all that at present can be well made out, and with the exception of which it appears in our maps as an inland tribe; certainly far less connected with the Mediterranean than many others. But it may fairly be presumed from this passage that the entire sea-board, as far as Zidon, was originally destined for Zebulun, although it failed to take actual possession thereof. (Compare Josh. xix. 15, and Jud. i. 20.) Possibly some of the cities mentioned in the former of these passages were situated along the coast. By means of the Phœnicians, however, it probably obtained

Digitized by Google

the advantages, or "abundance," of the sea; and precious things, as gold and gems, extracted from the sands of foreign lands.*

14 Issachar (is) a strong ass;
Lying down between the folds.
15 And he saw rest that (it was) good,
And the land that (it was) pleasant;
And he bowed his shoulder to bear,
And became a servant unto tribute. (Gen. xlix. 14, 15.)

The people of this rich tribe, unlike the maritime Zebulunites, contented themselves with their own fertile soil, and assiduously applied themselves to its culture. Concerning themselves little with political, military, or commercial affairs, they appear to have been peculiarly an agricultural race, and to have yielded considerable tribute to the kings and priests from the produce of their territory. The last clause does not imply anything discreditable; and it would not either be inferred, from the few historical notices of Issachar that occur, that it was dedicated to inglorious ease; or that, when occasion demanded, it was deficient in spirit and forwardness. The wealth, commercial and agricultural, of Zebulun and Issachar, appears to have been well employed; though this is rather gathered from the prophecy itself, than proved by history. (See, however, 1 Chron. xii. 40.) Perhaps in their journeys to Jerusalem at the solemn festivals, and at other times, the men of these tribes invited others to accompany them to "the mountain," and unite with them in offering sacrifices.

A better land, a happier rest, and richer treasures, than of old fell to *their* lot, are now set before the children of God. But while indolence or supineness deprives many of a considerable portion of the present enjoyment of these things, the diligence of others reminds us of the busy traffic of Zebulun, and the patient industry of Issachar. They dwell not in vain by the shore of a sea of blessings, nor regard with indifference the rich glebe of their pleasant land. And their pains are not unrequited. While others are poor in the midst of plenty, abundance crowns their toil, and hidden treasures repay their persevering search. They are not like the sluggard, who "desireth and hath nothing," but they bow their shoulder to bear, and call into exercise the strength with which they have been endowed. Such are also found zealous for the Lord, and anxious to attract others to the

* The Targum of Jonathan gives a curious, though perhaps somewhat fanciful, explanation of this verse.

Digitized by Google

mountain of his presence. Rejoicing in their going out, and in their tents, they excite their brethren to be mindful of the claims and the privileges of the sanctuary, and share with them their spiritual blessings. The qualities of the patient ass are as valuable in the Church as the courage and strength of the lion.

16 Dan shall judge his people,
As one of the tribes of Israel.
17 Dan shall be a serpent by the way,
A viper in the path;
That biteth the heels of the horse,
So that his rider falls backward. (Gen. xlix. 16, 17.)
22 And of Dan he said,
Dan is a lion's whelp;
(Which) leaps from Bashan. (Deut. xxxiii. 22.)

What is said of Dan, the first enumerated of the sons of the handmaids, we are probably to understand of the others also; viz., that they were to inherit, as tribes of Israel, equally with the sons of Leah and Rachel. The men of this powerful tribe, it appears, were remarkable for united craft and boldness. They resembled a lion leaping from Bashan to prey upon the cattle in the plains, and they were versed in the wiliness of the insidious serpent. Sacred history confirms these characteristics (Josh. xix. 47; Jud. xviii.); and they were strikingly displayed by Samson.

The combination of the qualities of the lion with those of the serpent, is to be seen in some of the Lord's people, as of old in Dan. The Apostle Paul might be instanced as eminently endowed with both courage and wisdom. An hostile world, and an host of spiritual enemies, afford ample scope for the exhibition both of one and the other. If a timid spirit is both injurious and unsuitable to a Christian, a fearless disposition, on the other hand, requires to be tempered and directed by wisdom. Some circumstances call for bold and decided acting—the lion's leap from Bashan. Others are better met by a wary and prudential course; as the cerastes, concealed by the way, brings the horseman to the ground, who might be prepared to encounter or escape the open assault of a wild beast. But to the wisdom of the serpent, we must also remember, our Saviour has bid us unite the harmlessness of the dove.

The aged patriarch pauses here to record his faith in the salvation promised to his fathers, (Luke i. 70—75; John viii. 56, &c.,) which he saw afar off, (Heb. xi. 13;) thereby also commending to his sons the cheering hope which had sus-

Digitized by Google

tained him throughout his chequered life, and now consoled him in his dying moments:—

18 For thy salvation I have waited, O Jehovah!
19 Gad, troops shall invade him;
But he shall invade (their) rear. (Gen. xlix. 19.)
20 And of Gad he said,
Blessed (be) he that enlargeth Gad;
As a lioness he dwelleth,
And teareth the arm with the crown of the head.
21 And he provided the first part for himself,
For there (in) a portion of the lawgiver, was he secured;
And he went (as) the heads of the people;
The justice of Jehovah he executed,
And his commandments with Israel. (Deut. xxxiii. 20, 21.)

Gad was continually exposed to incursions of the neighbouring Arabian hordes, which he seems not only to have repelled, but in turn to have pursued his invaders and spoiled them. (See 1 Chron. v. 18—22.) Deut. xxxiii. 21, is illustrated by Numb. xxxii. To this warlike tribe, at their own request, was assigned by the lawgiver "the first part" of the land, *i.e.*, a portion on the east of Jordan, where their families and flocks were kept in security, while they themselves, faithful to their engagement, went armed before their brethren to assist them in gaining possession of their inheritance. (Josh. i. 12—18; xxii. 1—6; 1 Chron. xii. 8.)

In the multiplied paronomasia in the Hebrew of Gen. xlix. 19, there is allusion to another signification of גָּד than that which obtains apparently in Gen. xxx. 11. The root, however, admits of both these derived senses. Thus, too, the patriarch, while alluding to the significations of Judah and of Dan (Gen. xlix. 8, 16), gives to the paronomasia a different association of thought to that in which the names originated. The territory of Dan was *enlarged* at different times. (Josh. xix. 47; Jud. xviii.)

The circumstances of some believers are such as to familiarize them more than others with conflict and temptation; and to bring them oftener in collision with the adversaries of the truth. Their lot, like that of Gad, borders on the enemies' land; whose invasions their valour and constancy not only enable them to repel, but also to make reprisals on their invaders. Their arm requires to be ever well practised, and the edge of their sword (Eph. vi. 17) kept sharp. They can least of all afford to give themselves up to ease and security. Too sensible of the sacredness and value of their

Digitized by Google

cause to purchase peace by unworthy compromise, they prefer, when necessary, the storm of controversy, to surrendering any part of "the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." Such were some of the noble confessors and reformers of former days, who, like the men of Gad in the forefront of Israel's battles, thought not of their own rest, until their brethren's inheritance was won for them. Blessed, indeed, is he that enlargeth such! for their zeal is not for the narrow and petty objects of a sectional division of the Church, but the length and breadth of catholic truth. They execute the justice of the Lord; and his blessing, and the gratitude of their brethren, reward their self-denying, and sometimes perilous labours. Often have the faithfulness and the courage of Gad been displayed in a cause more precious still than the conquest of Palestine, or the defence of the border, and been the means of preserving to others the quiet enjoyment of their spiritual blessings.

20 Out of Asher his bread (shall be) fat;
And he shall yield royal dainties. (Gen. xlix. 20.)
24 And of Asher he said,
Blessed with children (be) Asher;
Let him be acceptable to his brethren,
And let him dip in oil his foot.
25 Iron and brass (shall be) thy bars;
And as thy days, (so shall be) thy strength. (Deut. xxxiii. 24, 25.)

The rich inheritance of this tribe corresponded with its name. Its numerous population enjoyed abundance of corn and oil; and seem to have commended themselves to their brethren by a liberal and kindly disposition. Their country, either by the strength of its munitions, or some special protection from the Lord, was secured as by bars of iron and brass; and to crown so great blessings, a divine promise assured them of the uninterrupted continuance of their felicity—that their strength (or affluence) should be preserved to them during all their days.

While the blessings of other tribes were connected with various kinds of labour, and sometimes dangers and trial, it was the vocation of Asher simply to be *happy*. If in the rest we can recognise various other phases of our actual condition, by him we are reminded of the unalloyed happiness which is even now our portion in a risen and glorified Saviour. In his words one may say, "The Lord is the portion of mine inheritance and of my cup: thou maintainest my lot. The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have

Digitized by Google

a goodly heritage." (Ps. xvi. 5, 6.) Fat indeed is the bread that we eat, strong are the bars that maintain our security, faithful the promise that guarantees our everlasting bliss. And in those who permit not sin or unbelief to deprive them of the relish of their "royal dainties," who dip their feet, as it were, in the abundant oil of joy they have received, and whose spirits, brightened with conscious delight, cast a cheering radiance even on others' paths, we may see the true sons of Asher.

21 Napthali (is) a hind let loose:
He giveth words of pleasantness. (Gen. xlix. 21.)
23 And of Napthali he said,
(Let) Napthali (be) satisfied with favour,
And (be) full of the blessing of Jehovah:
The west and the south possess thou. (Deut. xxxiii. 23.)

The fine district of Napthali lay to the west and south with respect to the portion of Dan just before mentioned. It was highly favoured by the Lord; and its people, it may be inferred from Gen. xlix. 21, were remarkable for celerity and grace in action, and urbanity and pleasantness in speech. A certain attractive frankness in disposition and deportment, seems to have caused them to be likened to a hind exulting in its freedom; as the qualities of others suggested the several comparisons to the lion, the ass, the serpent, and the wolf.

And similar features distinguish some of those, who in a higher sense than Napthali, are satisfied with favour, and full of the blessing of the Lord. Their spirits emancipated from the thraldom of sin, and delivered from the fear that hath torment, rejoice in the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free. They realize in their hearts the full blessings of redemption, which has moreover imparted to their outward ways a certain graceful freedom, and lent its adornments to their minds and conversation. So long as the peace of the Gospel does not fill the soul, there must be uneasiness within, and constraint and awkwardness in every attempt to serve God. The hind is not let loose. Outward embarrassment will often indicate some inward bondage, while "pleasant words" naturally come from the lips of those, the abundance of whose hearts is Jesus and his love. (Col. iii. 15—17.) When the external *elegances* and amenities of Christianity accompany the possession of its essential qualities, we may again recognise Napthali among his brethren, and be reminded of the beautiful figure of old employed to describe him.

Digitized by Google

22 A fruitful bough (is) Joseph,
A fruitful bough by a well;
The branches run over the wall.
23 And have sorely grieved him, and shot (at him,)
And hated him, the archers.
24 But his bow abode in strength,
And the arms of his hands were strong,
By the hands of the mighty (one) of Jacob;
Thence (was) the shepherd, the stone of Israel.
25 By the God of thy father, who shall help thee;
And by the Almighty, who shall bless thee,
With blessings of heaven above,
With blessings of the deep that lieth under,
With blessings of the breasts and of the womb.
26 The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors,
Unto the desirable things of the everlasting hills:
They shall be on the head of Joseph,
And on the crown of the head of the prince of his brethren. (Gen. xlix. 22—27.)
13 And of Joseph he said,
Blessed of Jehovah (be) his land,
With the precious things of heaven, with the dew,
And with the deep that lieth beneath.
14 And with the precious things, fruits of the sun,
And with the precious things, produce of the months.
15 And with the chief things of the ancient mountains,
And with the precious things of the everlasting hills,
16 And with the precious things of the earth and the fulness thereof,
And (with) the good will of him that dwelt in the bush,
Let (this blessing) come upon the head of Joseph,
And upon the crown of the head of the prince of his brethren.
17 (Like) the firstling of his bullock (is) his glory,
And (like) the horns of an oryx (are) his horns;
With them he shall push the peoples together,
(To) the ends of the land;
And they (are) the myriads of Ephraim,
And they (are) the thousands of Manasseh. (Deut. xxxiii. 13—17.)

On the head of him who was indeed worthy of being called the נָזִיר or prince of his brethren (comp. Gen. xxxvii. 5—11); his father appears almost to exhaust the powers, both of language and conception, in invoking blessings.

Digitized by Google

Every good thing that either the heavens above, or the earth beneath, with its springs, could supply, was to be his. Exuberant fruitfulness in man and beast distinguished the land which was peopled by the myriads of Ephraim, and the thousands of Manasseh; and that yielded to them not only its annual, but its monthly produce. The emblem, as it were, of their chieftain, the "fruitful bough by a well" was seen wherever the eye could rest. The ancestral device appeared on hill and dale, and was blazoned on the mountain ranges of Ephraim, Bashan, and Gilead. His posterity might well be proud of the man whose virtue had both stood the test of bitter trial, and graced the possession of exalted honour; who in Egypt had been to Israel as a shepherd, and the foundation-stone of their fortunes; and from whom descended the captain, by whose victorious arms the tribes of Canaan were expelled,—pushed to the ends of the land, as if by the horns of an oryx.

The bush that burned, and yet was not consumed, has often been taken as a type of the preservation of God's people in their afflictions, through his presence with them. It was indeed a very fitting symbol to represent Israel's condition in Egypt, who multiplied and grew the more they were afflicted, and whom God watched over in the midst of the iron furnace. Thus the last-mentioned, and the best of the precious things of Joseph enumerated in the blessing of Moses, "the goodwill of Him that dwelt in the bush," would seem with peculiar propriety to be connected with the descendants of one who had been so eminently sustained in his trials, and kept unscathed in the fire of affliction. It may be, also, that Moses refers to the bush, as the time when he received his Divine commission, and was favoured with the first visible manifestation of the Lord; than whose goodwill the after-experience of all his life had shewn him, there was nothing more precious to possess for oneself, or desire for another. (Compare Jacob's *formula* of blessing, Gen. xlviii. 15, 16.)

If the misconduct of three of Jacob's sons affected their most distant posterity, it was to the piety of Joseph that his descendants owed their unrivalled lot. Happy had it been for them had they trodden in his steps. But the east wind, for the iniquity of Ephraim, came upon his fruitful land, and dried up his springs and fountains. (Hos. xiii. 15.) Nor is the time yet come for the flock of the heritage of the Lord to feed in Bashan and Gilead, as in the days of old. (Mic. vii. 14.) Nevertheless, there have been many in the house

Digitized by Google

of God, whose integrity and virtue have been sorely tried, and yet not found to fail them. The quiver of human enmity may almost at times have been emptied of its arrows to persecute them, but their bow, like Joseph's, abode in strength. A pure heart, a good conscience, and faith unfeigned, have clothed their spirits with a peaceful serenity, when prospects were blighted, and character assailed, and the cold iron seemed to enter into their very soul. They have been fruitful in the land of their affliction, and Divine favour has made them to forget all their toil, and all their father's house. If the world has frowned on them, the smile of Heaven has been their compensation. As amends for the enmity of kindred or brethren, they have enjoyed the good-will of Him that dwelt in the bush. In many instances, too, their painful discipline has resulted, not only in their own ultimate profit, but in important benefits to others. But as in the lion of Judah there is unquestionable allusion to Christ, so it seems probable that in this blessing of Joseph there is contained a reference to Him. It is familiar to all in what remarkable ways Jacob's favourite son was a type of the Lord Jesus,—of Him, who "learned obedience by the things which he suffered, and being made perfect, became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him," (Heb. v. 8, 9,)—of Him, to whom, in the highest sense, belong the titles of the Shepherd, and the Stone of Israel; and who is also to the people of God the Joshua, the "Captain of their salvation," who leads them into the rest that remaineth to them in the heavenly country—a better land than Joseph's, and with more precious things than his.

27 Benjamin (is) a wolf (which) tears in pieces;
In the morning he devours the prey;
And in the evening he divides the spoil. (Gen. xlix. 27.)

12 Of Benjamin he said,
Let the beloved of Jehovah
Dwell in safety by him;
He shall cover him all the day long,
And between his shoulders shall dwell. (Deut. xxxiii. 12.)

Benjamin, though a small, was notoriously a warlike tribe. But the comparison to a rapacious wolf seems to indicate a fierceness of character untempered with the nobler qualities that in some of his brethren made them to be compared to the royal lion. In the civil war (Judg. xx.) which had well nigh ended in the extinction of this tribe, its valour was as great as the cause for which it fought was evil. It furnished in Ehud a deliverer to Israel; who, however, in later years,

Digitized by Google

had little reason to rejoice in the Benjamite, who, first of all their race, wore the regal diadem. The blessing of Moses, however, turns exclusively on the circumstance of Jerusalem and the temple being in the territory of this tribe. Jehovah thus dwelt "between his shoulders," *i.e.*, the sides, or limits of his land.

Something of the character of Benjamin may be discovered in such as are deficient in the softer features of Christianity, while conspicuous for the possession of its sterner qualities. It is well that these latter should appear at suitable times, but not in the unmixed form, which gives to religion a harsh and repulsive aspect. Some in particular, who are incessantly engaged in attacking error, remind us of him who in the morning devoured the prey, and in the evening divided the spoil. Too little of meekness and moderation often appears in the advocacy of a good cause. But without exhibiting too much of the *wolfish* temperament of Benjamin, it is desirable that the believer should vividly apprehend his privilege as the "beloved of the Lord," to "dwell in safety by him." And we meet at times with those, who, in a more than ordinary degree, live in an ever conscious and happy realization of the Divine presence. Their lot may be comparatively small, but the Lord dwells within its limits, and his fellowship is to them, under all circumstances, an unfailing source of joy and strength.

The beautiful conclusion of the blessing of Moses is general, and relates to all the tribes. It will not be needful here to dwell upon its easy application to the circumstances of the spiritual Israel.

26 (There is) none like unto God, O Jeshurun;
(Who) rideth upon the heavens in thy help,
And in his excellency on the clouds.
27 (Thy) refuge (is) the eternal God,
And underneath (thee are) the everlasting arms;
And he has thrust out from before thee the enemy,
And has said, Destroy (them.)
28 And Israel shall dwell in safety;
Alone the fountain of Jacob (shall dwell);
In a land of corn and new wine;
Also his heavens shall drop down dew.
29 Happy (art) thou, O Israel; who (is) like unto thee,
O people saved by Jehovah,
The shield of thy help,
And who (is) the sword of thy excellency!
And thine enemies shall dissemble with thee,

Digitized by Google

And thou upon their high places shalt tread. (Deut. xxxiii. 26—29.)

This is evidently a description of Israel in their yet future condition of millennial felicity.

From the contemplation of the individual peculiarities of the twelve tribes, we may just turn, in conclusion, to the familiar and beautiful type presented in the xxviiith of Exodus. On the two onyx stones on the shoulders of the ephod, the names of the children of Israel were graven, "*according to their birth.*" *Here* all diversities vanish, and every tribe is on an equality. Just so the strength of the priesthood and intercession of Christ, as the true Aaron, sustain in an equal degree each member of his spiritual house. *Family relationship* alone is here in question, irrespective of all minor distinctions. We cannot determine with certainty in what order the names appeared on the stones of the breastplate, but it would seem as if another arrangement was there followed (v. 21.) Perhaps one in which, as in Deut. xxxiii., an *official* rather than a *domestic* priority was observed. If this be so, it would express a further *special* interest in the intercession of Christ, resulting from, and depending upon, those varieties of position, character, and calling, which make one Christian differ from another, as much as any two tribes differed of old. But even if the order were the same in both cases, there still remains the difference in respect of the precious stones. Yet here it consists only in varieties of lustre and beauty. The faultiness of Reuben, Simeon, and Levi, disappeared on the breastplate of Aaron. No record of past misdeeds sullied the brightness of the "memorial" that was "before the Lord continually," upon the heart of the high priest. Nor does Jesus, in the heavenlies, bear the names of the children of God before him, linked with any other memorial than that of the splendour and beauty which they have derived from himself. Whatever their dissimilarities here, and whatever their faults, as represented by their Priest above, the former merge into rich varieties of one common glory, while the latter entirely vanish. We may lose much on earth by sin, which will also undoubtedly, in certain respects, affect our future reward. But viewed as in Christ, every painful and humiliating association is gone; and in the radiance that beams from his breastplate, the diversity that appears is connected with no human imperfections. It is the same heavenly light that streams, as it were, from one name with the fiery glow of the carbuncle, and from another with the soft and lovely hue of the emerald. It is the same glory,

Digitized by Google

though it be reflected in different-coloured rays, from those in whom all peculiarities have disappeared, but such as are precious and divine.

Art. II.—THE HARMONIES OF GENESIS AND REVELATION.

No prophecy of Scripture, we are told, is of private interpretation. Each is no isolated fragment, which can be fully understood when taken alone, but is part of one harmonious system of Divine truth. Its real source is not the human discernment or dim guesswork of the individual writer, but the mind of that Spirit, who seeth the end from the beginning. And thus a patient and connected study is needful, in order to trace out the full meaning of these Divine messages: "For prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

This internal consistency, however, and harmony of mutual relation, is not peculiar to the prophecies, but extends to every part of the Word of God. The great diversity of the writers, in age, character, and style, only serves to illustrate more brightly the unity of that scheme of Providence, and system of Divine truth, which they reveal to us. One Mind plainly presides over the whole, and one breath of life animates every part of the message. As soon as we enter this glorious temple of Divine revelation, we may see the inscription on its lofty archway: "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, saith the Lord, which was, and is, and is to come, the Almighty."

A clear view of this unity in diversity, which pervades the whole Word of God, is eminently suited to confirm the faith of Christians, and deepen their reverence for its holy truths. It will be a complete antidote to the critical follies of those heartless anatomists, who strive, with unholy zeal, to resolve the Law and the Gospel alike into a chance medley of uncertain legends, and sicken our ears with profane fancies about Jehovah and Elohim documents in the books of Moses, and the mythical origin of the Gospel narratives. The impiety of these vain attempts is equalled by their folly. It needs only a close and patient study of the Word of God to discover harmonies beyond the reach of human skill, and a Divine and secret unity, amidst endless diversity, that speaks to the conscience and heart of the Christian more

Digitized by Google

plainly than the stars to the devout watcher at midnight,—"The hand that made us is Divine."

In the present paper my object is to unfold one striking example of this unity, by which the various books of Scripture are looped together, in the special harmonies of Genesis and the Book of Revelation. No two books of the Canon are so remote in time, or so completely contrasted in their most distinguishing features, when viewed as merely human compositions. The interval that separates them is more than fifteen hundred years. The first is a simple and unadorned history, the second a series of highly poetical visions. The first is the simplest form of Hebrew prose; the second, composed in a language then unborn, embodies the main features of Hebrew poetry. The first is a record of common events on earth; the second, to a great extent, a visionary description of wonders in heaven. The first is the preface to the Law, the second a supplement to the Gospel. The first was written by the adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter, learned in all the wisdom of Egypt; the second, by an unlearned fisherman of despised Galilee. One of them is full of almost innumerable details, the names of persons, places, and domestic annals of the most minute and various kind; while the other scarcely stoops to plant its foot upon earth, but dwells on a mount of high and holy vision, that seems far raised above all the petty details of space and time. When the former was written, Israel had scarcely begun to be a nation, and were either in Egyptian bondage, or still far from the promised land. But when the exile received his visions in Patmos, Israel were already outcasts from their land, and wanderers through the nations, after an inheritance, through fifteen hundred years, of the temporal promises made to their fathers. All things on earth were changed, Egypt, Canaan, Babylon; only God and His promises of grace, and plan of redeeming love, remained unchangeable. And hence, if we can shew the existence of a marked and special harmony between the earliest book of the old covenant and this latest and crowning message of the new dispensation, so that they answer to each other, like the loops in the curtains of the tabernacle, we shall have a clear proof of their Divine workmanship, and that the sacred penmen, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, have indeed made them according to a pattern in the holy mount of God.

Now the first harmony appears in the general subject with which these two books of Scripture are respectively

Digitized by Google

occupied. "Man has a mind of large discourse, looking before and after." The Word of God meets this law of human thought, and reveals to us Him who "was, and is, and is to come." Thus history, doctrine, and prophecy, are the three parts of revelation which answer to this threefold name of Jehovah. History reveals to us Him who was,—doctrine, Him who is,—and prophecy, Him who is to come. And thus history and prophecy are like two opposite poles of Divine revelation, which are harmonized by the unity of those Divine attributes of truth, holiness, and mercy, which they display in ages past or in ages to come.

Now the two books in question exhibit this contrast in its extreme form. The former carries our thoughts back to the birthday of the world, and the other leads them onward to the final judgment. When united by the intervening books of the Canon, they represent to us a scheme which goes back to the first hour of creation, and reaches onward into eternity. And yet, amidst this real contrast, the unity of design is equally apparent; since the canon of revelation is thus enlarged into a complete portraiture of the whole course of Divine Providence, from the beginning to the end of time. History and prophecy thus conspire together to complete the outline of His counsels, who is the first and the last, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.

But it is when the comparison is pursued into its various details that the resemblance and harmony come more fully to light. Let us endeavour to trace it under a few leading particulars, as they arise.

I. The Book of Genesis opens with a narrative of the great work of creation. Its first utterance is that comprehensive truth: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Creation is the key-note, from which the Divine music begins, though it modulates quickly into another and minor key, of sin, curse, and judgment.

Now when we turn to the Apocalypse, we see that this key-note, after long ages have intervened, is taken up once more, and forms the closing passage to the whole compass of the Divine melody. "I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away. And he that sat on the throne said, BEHOLD, I MAKE

Digitized by Google

ALL THINGS NEW. And he said unto me, Write, for these words are true and faithful."

What a simple and sublime harmony here discloses itself between the earliest and latest message of the Word of God! It opens with a glorious and magnificent truth,—the creation of the heavens and earth by the will of the Almighty. But sin and death find entrance, and long ages of sadness and sorrow intervene, till God himself, by a vivid and expressive figure, is said to repent of His own work. Then, after a long delay, the promised Deliverer appears. And still there is another season of hope deferred, while darkness covers the earth, and gross darkness the people. But His work of love advances slowly and surely, conquering and to conquer, till at length, by the light of prophecy, we see the promised redemption complete. And now creation, like the fabled phœnix, is seen rising once more out of the ashes of sin and corruption. The first heaven and the first earth will pass away, with sin and sorrow, crying and tears, and the terrible curse, which has eaten out, like a canker, the glory of the works of God. Yet the language which announces the final triumph of love, carries back our thoughts to the day of the first creation, when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy. He whose name is Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, sits upon the throne of judgment, and the voice which consummates the redemption reminds us still of the birth-day of the unfallen universe: "Behold, I make all things new."

II. In the six days' work of creation, the first step was the emanation of light. "The earth was without form, and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light, and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good, and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night; and the evening and the morning were the first day."

Thus the Book of Genesis opens with this beautiful description of the natural change, when "orient light" exhaled from the darkness, and began to brood over this lower creation, to aid its progress into order and beauty. In striking harmony with this statement, the Apocalypse closes with a prophecy of that Divine and uncreated light which will supersede, in the homes of the blessed, all outward sources of illumination, so that the alternations of day

Digitized by Google

and night will be lost in one unbroken day of eternal glory. The heavenly city descends from on high, "having the glory of God, and her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper-stone, clear as crystal." And how does the description, as it continues, rise in grandeur and beauty! "And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine on it, for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. And the nations of them that are saved shall walk in the light of it. And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day; for there shall be no night there." And still the Spirit seems not content without once again fixing our thoughts upon this celestial splendour, which eclipses the glory of natural light, however beautiful, either in the inventions of man, or even the outward works of nature, and repeats the sublime promise: "And there shall be no night there, and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light, and they shall reign for ever and ever."

Thus, the old creation, in its first-born offspring, and purest and highest gift, serves only for the type of a higher blessing, which shall be the inheritance of the redeemed in the ages to come. The Word of God, in the book of Genesis, begins by pouring the flood of natural light over the outward universe. It ends, in the book of Revelation, by exhibiting that supernatural light, proceeding from the throne, which will swallow up the other with its own intenser radiance, and form the blessed portion of countless spirits, redeemed from the darkness of the fall, who shall see light for ever in the light of God.

III. The next main feature in the history is the threefold separation of this lower universe. "And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters. . . . And God called the firmament Heaven. . . . And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so. And God called the dry land Earth, and the gathering together of the waters called he Seas: and God saw that it was good."

Here we may digress for one moment, to explain that obscure phrase which has given rise to many speculations in earlier times,—"the waters that are above the firmament." Its clear and simple meaning, in my opinion, is that portion of water which our atmosphere sustains in the state of vapour, and which is therefore invisible. The firmament, in this description, is nothing else than the boundary to our sense of vision. All below the firmament is visible,

Digitized by Google

as the earth and seas, and the clouds that float in our lower atmosphere. All that is invisible, by contrast, is represented as above the firmament. In other words, it is removed beyond the sphere of our natural vision. And thus the natural heaven, the treasury of the unseen powers of nature, is a fitting emblem of that higher heaven, the object of faith, which is the treasure-house of all the things unseen and eternal.

Now if we turn to the Apocalypse, this threefold division is one prominent feature of its emblems, which meets us again and again with a peculiar frequency, hardly to be found elsewhere in the Word of God. It appears first in that celestial anthem, where all creatures join in the praises of Christ: "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing and honour, and glory and power, be unto Him that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever."

It appears again, almost with equal distinctness, in the sixth seal. The heaven is seen to depart, as a scroll when it is rolled together, and every mountain, the main feature of the land, and every island, the only habitable portion of the sea, are moved out of their places. In other words, the convulsion, whether in letter or figure, affects alike all these three divisions of the lower universe.

In the series of the trumpets, the same character appears, with only the addition of the rivers of water, as a fourth element. For these are like a golden thread, binding together these three parts of universe. They are linked with the heavens in their rise, with the dry land in their progress, and with the sea, as their final home. One trumpet accordingly affects the earth, another the sea, and another the lights of the starry firmament.

The same allusion is found, still more plainly, in the solemn oath of the mighty angel, which announces the long-delayed close of the mystery of God: "And the angel lifted up his hand to heaven, and sware by Him that liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven and the things that are therein, and the earth, and the things that are therein, and the sea, and the things that are therein, that there should be time no longer; but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God shall be finished, as He hath declared to His servants the prophets."

In the vision of the twelfth, and following chapters, the

Digitized by Google

same distinction is the basis of the prophecy. First, the woman is seen in heaven, then the Dragon is cast down to earth, and lastly, the Beast is seen rising from the sea. And it is found more plainly in the voice of the angel, who proclaims the everlasting Gospel: "Fear God, and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment is come; and worship him that made *heaven*, and *earth*, and *the sea*, and the fountains of waters."

Finally, in the vision of the last judgment, the same allusion appears in a distinct and manifest form: "I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and first earth were passed away, and there was no more sea." There is here a plain reference to the early history of creation, and the threefold division then constituted by the Word of God,—the firmament, the dry land, and the gathering of the waters: "God called the firmament, Heaven. And God called the dry land, Earth; and the gathering together of the waters he called Seas." The commencement of the sacred history, and the close of the sacred prophecy, like the loops of the tabernacle, correspond perfectly with each other.

IV. The history records the appointment of the heavenly luminaries, and their double office. They were to be for signs and seasons, and days and years; and also to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness. The Apocalypse presents them to our view under precisely the same features. They are there used as signs or emblems of spiritual truths, the measures of sacred chronology, and marks of contrast between light and darkness; and it closes with a description of that state where their office is superseded by the perpetual daylight of heaven.

First, they are used as signs or emblems of spiritual things. The seven stars in the hand of the Great High Priest denote the angels of the seven Churches. The darkened sun, the blood-red moon, and the falling stars, are the emblems under the sixth seal, and omens of Divine judgment. In the fourth trumpet, the sun, the moon, and the stars, all the lights of heaven, are darkened in the firmament, and one third of their light withdrawn, as a sign of the coming woes. The woman seen in heaven, an emblem of the Church of Christ, is clothed with the sun, has the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars. The fourth vial is poured upon the sun, and scorching heat is given it to plague the sinful nations. In all these cases the heavenly

Digitized by Google

lights of the fourth day are used for most expressive emblems in the symbolical universe of the prophecy. Again, these lights were for seasons, for days, and years. To this fact there is a very striking allusion in the various mention of the prophetic intervals. The first woe, the treading down of the Holy City by the Gentiles, and the dominion of the beast, all works of darkness, are defined by the periods of the moon, which was appointed to rule over the night. But the prophesying of the witnesses, the sojourn of the woman in the wilderness, all that relates to the children of light, is measured by days or years, the periods of the sun, which was appointed to rule over the day. And last of all, when the redemption is complete, the divided rule of these luminaries is replaced by the unchanging glory of the Creator and Redeemer. "The city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it, for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof."

V. The history, in the two last days of Creation, exhibits three main events, the creation of the moving things of the sea, of the beasts of the earth, and, lastly, of man himself, as their common lord and governor, to whom dominion is given over all these lower creatures.

Now, when we turn to the Apocalypse, it exhibits an exact and complete analogy to this primitive succession. In the thirteenth chapter a monster is presented to our view, which has the sea for his birthplace, and exercises, for a time, a mighty and cruel dominion. We have next a second beast, rising from the earth or dry land, which shares in this bestial dominion, and exercises all the power of the first beast in his presence. Then succeeds a vision of one like unto the Son of man, sitting on a cloud, who appears to execute judgment. A later vision (chap. xix.) presents the relation between them in a clearer light. The Son of man, who is also the Word of God, appears clothed with the vesture of Divine authority, and claims to himself the supreme dominion, for "on his vesture and thigh a name is written, King of kings and Lord of lords." The beast from the sea, and the beast from the earth, or the false prophet, are taken captive by the armies of the celestial Horseman, and are cast alive into the place of punishment. The usurped and bestial dominion is finished, and Man, in the person of the great Redeemer, assumes his original and long-forfeited supremacy: "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because

Digitized by Google

he is THE SON OF MAN." The empire, first of brutal force, the Leviathan of the deep,—and then of fraud and deception, the wily and lamb-like pretences of false religion and subtle priestcraft, shall perish for ever, and be succeeded by the everlasting supremacy of reason, love, and holiness, in the person of Jesus Christ our Lord.

VI. According to the history, after the six days of creation were finished, there ensued a sabbath of rest. "On the seventh day God ended his work which he had made: and He rested on the seventh day from all his work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it He had rested from all his work which God created and made."

The prophecy in the close of the Apocalypse exhibits an evident antitype of this primitive history. At a time which is evidently future, and probably near at hand, and when six thousand, or nearly six thousand, years of the world's history are finished, a glorious vision of hope and peace is presented to our view. "I saw thrones, and they sat on them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the Word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads or their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

Here only a few remarks appear needful, to illustrate and confirm the intimate relation between the type in the history and the antitype in the prophecy. And first, St. Peter tells us that, in the sight of the Lord, a thousand years are as one day. Six thousand years, the past duration of the world from the time of Adam, will thus answer to a period of six days, the time of creation. The space of a thousand years, here predicted, and evidently future, will answer to the seventh day, which followed the work of creation, the first sabbath of rest. And this resemblance is confirmed by the immediate antecedent in either case. In the history it is the dominion of man, constituted lord over all the lower creatures, whether in earth or sea. In the prophecy it is the victory of the Son of man over all his enemies, and especially over the beasts from the earth and from the sea, with

Digitized by Google

the first commencement of His visible reign of peace and righteousness. Those also who share this dominion are called blessed and holy, terms which apply most fitly to the first great Sabbath of a ransomed universe, and to the character of all those who partake of its holy blessedness.

VII. The history next exhibits to us the earthly Paradise, with the tree of life in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Amidst all the variety of that beautiful and fertile landscape, our eyes are fixed on these only; one of them the occasion of the first entrance of evil, and the other a Divine and healing remedy. Man, however, perversely tasted the forbidden tree of knowledge, and lost access to the tree of life; and hence began the long, weary course of sin and sorrow.

In the prophecy, the record of redemption, no mention is made of the tree of knowledge, though the effects resulting from its bitter taste are conspicuous in every part of the visions. But, on the other hand, the tree of life appears in it, from first to last, with added features of dignity and spiritual glory. Its place is the heavenly Paradise, along the banks of the river of life. The single tree is now replaced by a prolific grove, yielding every month its celestial fruitage, and even its very leaves are endued with a medicinal virtue. The type of the history passes into a symbol in the prophecy, and is transfigured and glorified in the change.

The first mention of it occurs in the opening vision, in the message of our Lord to the first of the seven Churches,—"He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches. To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God." It is thus made to usher that galaxy of delightful promises by which our Lord has provided comfort to his people to the end of time, and introduced the solemn revelation of coming judgments.

After these warning visions have run their course, and the vessel, through stormy seas of change, has reached its haven of rest, the tree of life comes once again into view, and closes the whole Divine message. "In the midst of the street, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations." Blessed contrast, between the sin and misery of Eve, in tasting the tree of knowledge, and the happy privilege of the heavenly Bride, feasting on the love of God, which is life and peace, for ever and ever!

Digitized by Google

And here the relation is the more striking, because no mention of the tree of life occurs elsewhere in the New Testament. It is reserved for this latest message, that it may serve to clasp together the volume of inspiration, and illustrate the marvellous unity of design which pervades the whole.

VIII. Another feature of the history is the mention of the rivers which watered Paradise at the beginning. Its fertility was maintained by the confluence of four different streams. The first of these compassed the land of Havilah, where there was gold and bdellium, and the onyx stone. The second had its source in the land of Cush; the third was Hiddekel, where Daniel afterwards received his latest prophecy; and the fourth river was Euphrates.

Now here also the prophecy exhibits features of resemblance, varied by contrast, but only the more expressive of their mutual harmony. The four streams, watering Paradise, fitly represent the confluence of all the variety of creature happiness. But the higher blessedness of the redeemed flows direct from the uncreated source of all goodness. God himself is their portion. With Him is the fountain of life, and in His light they shall see light. And thus the heavenly Paradise is watered by one single river, with this significant description, that "it proceedeth from the throne of God and of the Lamb." The type, in passing into a symbol, is modified, to express a deeper happiness, and a higher glory. It is not all the varieties of created beings on which the blessedness of the saints will depend, but on God the Creator, and the co-equal Son of God, their Divine Redeemer. It is not the land of Cush or Asshur, with all its resources of worldly greatness, that will supply the fountains which refresh their spirits; but peace, like a river, flows to them from the God of peace, and love blesses them for ever, from the very Fountain of uncreated and eternal love.

But this does not exhaust the beautiful harmony between the historical type and the prophetical antitype, in these rivers of Paradise. The gold, the bdellium, and the onyx stone, carry our thoughts at once to the further description, in the same vision, of the city through which the celestial river is seen to flow. There, under the name of chalcedony, the onyx is seen among the foundations of the city, but is joined with a rich variety of "all manner of precious stones," while the street itself is "pure gold, as it were transparent glass." Again, the river Hiddekel is mentioned elsewhere only in Daniel's latest prophecy, which has the closest and

Digitized by Google

most varied relation to the visions of the Apocalypse. It was on the banks of the Hiddekel that the prophet had that revelation of our Lord, which minutely resembles his later appearance to the beloved Apostle. It was on the banks of the Hiddekel that the heavenly querists obtained the answer, which finds its exact counterpart in the voice of the sun-bright Angel. "I heard the man, clothed with linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand to heaven, and sware by Him that liveth for ever, that it shall be for a time, times, and an half; and when he shall have accomplished scattering the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished." Here the substance of the whole Apocalypse, and almost the very words of that oath which forms its central message, are linked with the revived mention of the third river of Paradise.

But in the case of the fourth river, the relation between the history and the prophecy is still more apparent. The Euphrates is first named in this description of the earthly Paradise. After the fall and banishment of man, its name is linked with a mournful record of human pride and ungodliness, the confusion of Babel, and every evil work. In Isaiah it is contrasted with the gentle stream of Siloah, and represents the old Assyrian Empire, in the height of its worldly pride and ambition, under the fierce Sennacherib, who perished suddenly by a Divine judgment. In the New Testament the only mention of the Euphrates is in this prophecy. Here it meets us in the second woe, and under the sixth vial, and is placed in evident contrast to the river of life, which waters the Paradise of God. From the border of its streams issues forth the severest woe upon a corrupt and worldly Church, and those streams are afterwards dried, upon the approach of judgment, to prepare the full triumph of the true Cyrus, the King of righteousness and of peace. The river which once watered the earthly Paradise, after being defiled and degraded by scenes of violence and pride, which had revelled and triumphed for long ages in old Babylon, disappears, at least in figure, under the vials of judgment; and the vision afterwards reveals to us its only substitute, in the pure river of the water of life, proceeding from the throne.

IX. The marriage of Adam and Eve, though earlier in time, appears next in the order of the narrative. It was clearly the latest work of the sixth day, which ushered in the first sabbath of rest. Eve, after being fashioned during

Digitized by Google

the sleep of Adam, is brought to him as his bride, and the celebration of their marriage closes the history of creation. It was a time of heavenly rejoicing, and of earthly happiness; but still the blessing, to the eye of wisdom, was incomplete. Instated in the dominion over all the creatures, our first parents were still ignorant of the deeper mysteries of good and evil, and unclothed upon with the glory of supernatural grace. "They were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed."

The Apocalypse here presents a counterpart, where the features of contrast only deepen the harmony between the early type, and the antitype which closes the drama of Divine providence. What is the last main event which is there exhibited, before the commencement of the sabbatism of a thousand years? It is the bridal of the second Adam, the Lord from heaven. "I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of many thunderings, saying, Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his bride hath made herself ready." Yet, while the resemblance is clear and full, the contrast is no less apparent. All the secret imperfection of the type is revealed in the glorious antitype. The creature no longer stands alone, in unsullied, but naked, purity; on the contrary, it is clothed upon with a Divine beauty, the robe of supernatural grace, wrought by the power of the Spirit of God. "And to her it was given that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints." No fig-leaves of vain and false excuses for sin, like those with which Adam and Eve endeavoured to conceal the deformity of sin, nor even the sacrificial clothing of skins, which denotes the pardoning mercy that first conceals the shame of the returning and penitent sinner; but robes of beauty and glory, like those which form the clothing of the great High Priest himself, the perfect image of Christ, in righteousness and true holiness, whereby the beauty of the Lord their God will be around His ransomed ones for ever and ever, and they shall be pure as He is pure, holy as He is holy, and perfect as their Father which is in heaven is perfect.

Here we may pause for the present. The history of creation has revealed to us many harmonies: the narrative of the fall will disclose others, more sad and mournful in the type, but in the antitype, not less delightful and glorious. Even these may serve to impress on our minds more deeply the

Digitized by Google

meaning of that glorious title of our Lord, the frontispiece of His holy prophecy—"I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which was, and which is, and which is to come, the Almighty."

Art. III.—THE DOMINION OF THE SECOND ADAM, AND THE BLESSEDNESS OF CREATION UNDER HIS RULE.

The covenant of redemption, or, as it is sometimes called, the covenant of grace, is the groundwork of all God's dealings with fallen man. A covenant of works, with implied promises and expressed threatenings, was made with Adam before the fall. He failed to keep it, and it was then that God, out of his mere good pleasure, and the Son, out of his infinite condescension, were pleased to renew the covenant for the behoof of the fallen race of man. In pursuance of this great design, Christ became man, and thus entering into Adam's place, receives from the apostle the title of "the second Adam, the man from heaven." Nor is this a mere empty name. Becoming the second Adam, he undertook to accomplish all in which the first Adam had failed,—to endure the penalty of the broken covenant, which the first Adam never could have paid, and to win, for as many as shall become his sons through faith, the inheritance conditionally promised to the first Adam, but by him lost for ever. It is unnecessary that we should here enter upon the mighty issues of salvation which depended upon this renewed covenant. But there are certain considerations, leading directly to our present subject, which flow from the truth, *that Christ is the second Adam*, to which our attention must now be directed.

Whatever, then, belonged to the first Adam, in virtue of the covenant of life made with him in paradise,—whatever he lost by his fall,—must be the inheritance of the second Adam, in virtue of his having fully discharged the conditions of that covenant.

Turning, then, to the first chapter of Genesis, we find that God said: "Let us make man *in our image*, after our likeness, and let them *have dominion* over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man *in his own image*, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And

Digitized by Google

God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: *and have dominion* over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the face of the earth." (Gen. i. 26—28.) This, then, is man's original charter, securing to him God's image and universal dominion. The charter, however, was not without conditions, and inasmuch as the conditions were not observed, the inheritance was lost. But the point for which we contend is *this*, that when the second Adam fulfilled the conditions of the charter, that very inheritance, *and no other*,—the inheritance, namely, of humanity in God's image, and of dominion over the works of God's hands,—became *his* of right, and must be enjoyed by *him*, and shared by those whose representative he is.

But here, perhaps, the objection may be made—and we are anxious at this early stage to dispose of it, that such an inheritance as this is all too earthly to be indeed the scriptural expectation held out to man. Let it be remembered, however, that the earth is the work of God's hands, that he made it *all very good;* that he finished and perfected it before he created Adam to be its lord; and that we cannot, therefore, come to any other conclusion than that it was a fit habitation for the creature which he made. No doubt it is now marred and destroyed, and in its present condition could not be a suitable dwelling-place, either for Adam as God created him, or for the redeemed children of men. But who shall say, that, when it shall be restored to its original perfection (and this is part of the promise for the fulfilment of which we contend), it will not be as suitable a habitation as ever it could have been, for those in whom God's image is renewed, and who are delivered from the bondage of corruption and even the taint of sin? God is not done with this world of ours. He will yet replenish it with all that is lovely, all that is good, all that is desirable, so that it shall be a monument of his glory to every being that shall look upon it, in the day when he shall make all things new. Nor is this expectation, that the renewed earth shall be the habitation of the blessed, peculiar to pre-millennialists. It forms the creed of many who differ with us as to the time of our Lord's second coming. "Some," says a recent impugner of the doctrine of a pre-millennial advent, "shrink from the opinion that the new heavens and new earth shall be the final abode of the redeemed, as tending to carnalize, or at least to lower, our views of the celestial state. But may not

Digitized by Google

such sensitiveness spring from an unconscious confounding of the present wretched state with that which is expected to take its place? May there not be in it some tincture of that morbid spiritualism which shrinks from the very touch of materialism, as if separation from it in every form would be the consummation of happiness? . . . Certainly, if the earth was implicated in the curse, it is natural to expect that it should share in its removal. Certainly the glorified bodies, both of the Redeemer and the redeemed, derive their elements from the dust of this ground, which will thus, in their persons at least, for ever endure. And if it be no degradation to the Son of God to take it into his own person, as the first-born from the dead,—if the dust of this ground is capable of becoming a spiritual and a glorious body, a meet vehicle for the perfected and beatified spirit, the sharer of its bliss in the immediate presence, and the instrument of all its activities in the service of God and of the Lamb,—it does seem hard to conceive how the very system, which has furnished all these elements of incorruption, and spirituality, and beauty, and glory, when its present constitution shall be dissolved, and when new and higher laws shall be stamped upon it,—should be incapable of furnishing a congenial abode for the glorified Church."*

Thus, then, it is no exclusive doctrine of pre-millennialists that the renewed earth shall be the final habitation of the redeemed. But before entering more particularly into this subject, let us direct attention to the means by which the Redeemer works out his great plan of preparing an inheritance for his people, and a people for the inheritance. It is altogether a work of *new creation.* So marred hath this world become by the entrance of sin, and by its present subjection to the rule of the prince of darkness, that it cannot be mended, but must be taken to pieces, and moulded afresh; and so utterly ruined is human nature, by the same causes, that nothing but a work of new creation can restore it. This work hath Christ been carrying on from the hour when he first took upon him the mediatorial office. He begins it in the *heart* of man, and, just as our connexion with the first Adam arises out of our natural birth, so our connexion with the second Adam arises out of our being born *again*, regenerated, or made new creatures in Christ Jesus. The old man is mortified more and more, and the new man more and more strengthened, during our whole lifetime, and at death only are we made perfect in holiness. Nor is the work of

* Brown on the Second Advent, page 18.

Digitized by Google

new creation *even then* brought to a close. The *body* also, being united to Christ, awaits in the grave a glorious resurrection. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. And so it is written: "The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a life-giving Spirit." But the work of new creation still goes on. The whole framework of nature must be renovated, the curse removed, the blessedness of Eden restored, and free access again opened unto the tree of life. Even the millennium, however, is not a state of absolute perfection. *Most* things have been made new, but not *all:* there are still lurking there the seeds of a final apostasy, which, when Satan is loosed from his prison-house, shall spring up with rapid growth, and for a moment threaten to overspread the earth with its noxious shade. But when the axe has been laid to the root of that last tree of bitterness, and the last enemy of the Redeemer's reign shall have been overthrown, then shall the work of new creation have been completed; then shall his kingdom have been perfected, and having been presented unto the Father for his approval, shall be established throughout everlasting ages, for the glory of the Godhead, and the supreme felicity of the redeemed.

Such, then, is a brief view of the scriptural connexion between the dominion of the second Adam and the rest of the Divine plan of redemption, and we shall now endeavour to illustrate the subject by the examination of some of the passages of God's Word which bear upon it.

The Eighth Psalm contains a full assertion of the dominion of Christ as the second Adam. The psalmist beholds the glory of God displayed in the starry vault, and exclaims: "What is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him a little" (or, for a little while,) "lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet: all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas." These expressions evidently refer to the dignity bestowed upon Adam, and the very words are rehearsed in which the grant is recorded in the book of Genesis. David, writing after that dominion had been in a great measure withdrawn, and the earth smitten with a curse, still speaks of

Digitized by Google

the grant as one which had not by any means been revoked: and we might perhaps conclude, from the opening of the psalm, in which he speaks of stilling the enemy and the avenger (or tormentor), by which term Satan appears to be intended, that this dominion, which was the birthright of Adam, shall be restored by some direct interposition of judgment on the part of the Almighty. More, perhaps, we could not learn from the psalm itself, but we have an inspired commentary upon it in the writings of the Apostle Paul, who quotes it no less than three times in his epistles.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 5), the apostle quotes this psalm in confirmation of the proposition, that God hath *not* put into subjection *unto angels the world to come of which he speaks.* What, then, is this world to come, or, as the original signifies, this *habitable world to come?** (1). It is not the present Gospel state, for when the apostle wrote, the Gospel dispensation had been already established, and the Jewish dispensation had passed away. The *Gospel* state, then, could not possibly be called by him *the world to come.* Nor, indeed, does the psalm itself appear to have any relation whatever to the Gospel dispensation. It speaks of sheep, oxen, beasts of the field, fowls of the air, fish of the sea, being subject to man; a state of matters which has no very evident reference to the present Evangelical economy. (2). The world to come is *not heaven,* for heaven can scarcely be called, in any sense, "the world to come," or literally, the habitable earth to come: and, moreover, Christ has *now* dominion over *heaven,* but the apostle, in the verses following, positively says that he has not yet dominion over the world to come. Besides, it is manifest, as Dr. Owen remarks, that the phrase denotes "a certain state and condition of things in *this* world; for the apostle is not treating directly of heaven." And we conclude, therefore, with that learned man, that the apostle alludes to the new heavens and new earth, in opposition to the heavens and earth which now are. These are the habitable world of which the apostle speaks. It is these that have not been put into subjection to angels, but are to be put in subjection unto Jesus Christ. To prove this assertion, the apostle quotes the Eighth Psalm: "What is man, that thou art mindful of him?" &c., and ending with the words, "Thou hast put all things under his feet;" and then he adds, "For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus,

* See Mandeville's "Horæ Hebraicæ," page 184.

Digitized by Google

who was a little" (or, for a little while) "lower than the angels," for the suffering of death, "crowned with glory and honour." What can be more plain, than that he of whom the psalmist speaks as made, for a little, lower than the angels,—as crowned with glory and honour,—as being set over all the works of God's hands,—is indeed the Lord Jesus Christ. Of him the psalm is an express prophecy: "For," says the apostle, looking around for a proof of his assertion, "*one* in a certain place *testified,* saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him?"

Having now obtained the key to the right understanding of the psalm, let us return to the exposition of it. "What is man," says the psalmist, "that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou hast made him for a little while lower than the angels." He is full of admiration at God's goodness in visiting, or having mercy, upon man; and the special instance of his goodness which he has in view is *the incarnation.* For God in a most special manner visited man, and showed his condescension in visiting him, when he took a man's body, and a man's reasonable soul, into union with himself, being born of the Virgin Mary. There is, of course, as has been already explained, an allusion to Adam, and to God's grant of dominion given to him. But that the psalm has reference to something higher, appears, not only from the apostle's quotation, but also from the psalm itself. God's goodness to Adam could scarcely be a meet subject of praise for David, when the dominion given had been already lost; nor in Adam's time was there any enemy or avenger to be stilled; nor could it be said of Adam, *in any sense,* that the world to come was put under his feet. Another Adam than our first parent is here manifestly in view. Even the Jewish commentators speak of the *Adam above,* or the *Adam on high,* who has dominion over all things, even as the first man, the Adam below, had over the lower world. By the incarnation, then, man was "*minded,*" "*visited,*" *exalted* by God, exalted indeed far above angels, for manhood was in that hour taken into union with the Divinity. And yet, by the state of humiliation into which the Redeemer entered, in order to compass the salvation of men, he was made, *for a little,* lower than the angels. "It was," says Owen, when defending the rendering, 'for a little while,' "but for a little while, that the person of Christ, in the nature of man, was brought into a condition more indigent than the state of angels is exposed unto: neither was

Digitized by Google

he for that season made a little, but very much lower than the angels."

The psalmist tells us that the Son of man, who was made for a little while lower than the angels, was crowned with glory and honour. The apostle interprets, by informing us that we see Jesus, who was made for a little while lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour. And thus it is plainly proved, that this clause refers to Christ's present exaltation at the right hand of God.

Lastly, the psalmist affirms, that God hath made him to have dominion over the works of his hands, and hath put all things under his feet. And the apostle says, "But now we see not yet all things put under him." Whence we learn, that this clause of the psalm is not yet fulfilled, but is reserved for the world to come. It was not fulfilled in the days of the apostle, and no event has since taken place which can for one moment be supposed to be a fulfilment. We learn, therefore, that, although God has by an eternal decree given him dominion, we shall never see that dominion until the time shall come when all his enemies shall be made his footstool. Then shall all things be put beneath his rule as the second Adam, all sheep, and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas. Nor can we understand this language as merely figurative, because it is simply a rehearsal of God's original grant to Adam. If the dominion given to Adam is expressed in language not figurative, but literal, the same language, when applied to the dominion of the second Adam, must be understood to be literal also.

In the Epistle to the Ephesians, we find the apostle again quoting the Eighth Psalm. He had informed them (ch. i. 9, 10) that the mystery of God's will, and the purpose which he had purposed, was, "that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth:" that in Christ believers have already "obtained an inheritance," (ver. 11); that the inheritance is not yet enjoyed, but that, in the mean time, they were "sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise," which is "the earnest of their inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession," (ver. 13, 14.) He calls upon them to contemplate, for their encouragement, "the riches of the glory of God's inheritance in the saints, and the

Digitized by Google

exceeding greatness of his power toward those who believe," as first manifested in raising Christ from the dead, and setting him at his own right hand, in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but *also in that which is to come:* and then he adds, from our psalm, "*And hath put all things under his feet,* and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." (Ver. 19—23.) Now, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the apostle has expressly said, "We see not yet all things put under him," we cannot doubt, that in writing to the Ephesians, he was teaching them to look forward to good things *yet to come;* things already belonging to Christ by decree, but not yet his in actual possession. And the special lesson, upon the subject before us, which is taught in this epistle to the Ephesians is, that in the world to come, when the second Adam shall be invested with the dominion which belongs to him, his *Church* shall, at the same time, be gathered together, and shall be manifested as the fulness of him that filleth all in all: and that, when he becomes head over all creation, he shall be head over all things *to,* or *for,* his Church.

The third place in which the apostle quotes our psalm is in the xvth of 1 Corinthians. He is there speaking of the resurrection. "As in Adam," he says, "all die; even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. Then (or afterwards) cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom unto God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For *he* (*i.e.*, God) *hath put all enemies under his feet.*" Here there are three epochs mentioned. First, Christ's resurrection; secondly, Christ's coming; thirdly, the end. As between the first of these and the second there hath been a long interval, so between the second and third there shall be a long interval also—even a thousand years—the millennium—the period of Christ's reign. All his enemies shall not be put under his feet till the conclusion of that period, but he shall be engaged during his reign in putting them down. When he first leaves the right hand of the Father, he shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath; but till Gog and Magog are consumed, there shall not be a final destruction of his enemies. When he comes

Digitized by Google

again, Satan shall be bound, but the fruits of his hostility shall not cease, until, at the close of the millennium, he is cast into the lake of fire. When the Redeemer raises up his people at his coming, death shall be, *in their case*, swallowed up in victory; but death, the last enemy, shall not be destroyed, until death and hell are cast into the lake of fire. The lesson taught us in this quotation is, that the resurrection and the world to come are coincident in point of time, that when Christ shall take the dominion as the second Adam, he shall appear at the head of the glorified saints. And this truth the apostle still further illustrates in the course of his argument. "The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam, a lifegiving spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthly; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."

Such then is the light we gather from the commentaries of the apostle upon the Eighth Psalm, and it is sufficient to set fully before us the first part of our subject—the dominion of the second Adam. We learn that it is a dominion over the habitable world to come, over the new heavens and earth, and all that is therein; that it belongs to him in virtue of his incarnation, and of the original grant made to Adam at his creation—that it shall be exercised by him for the benefit of his redeemed Church, whom, at his coming to inherit it, he shall raise from the dead, even as he also hath risen from the dead, by the power of God the Father; that he shall perfect this dominion more and more, during his millennial reign, and then deliver it up to the Father; not in such a sense, however, as that he shall denude himself of it, for his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion shall never pass away. Some other points will fall more naturally to be discussed under the second part of our subject—the blessedness of creation under the rule of the second Adam, to which we shall now direct our attention.

And here the variety of the subject oppresses us. The many mingling glories of the vision reflect radiance upon one another, like precious stones set side by side in a jewelled diadem, till the aggregate lustre dazzles and confounds the eye. Let us take up some of the prominent topics in detail.

Digitized by Google

The scene or locality of his dominion, "the new heavens and new earth." It is no unknown planet, no unimagined locality, that is to be the scene of the future blessedness of the saints of God. This very earth, and these heavens, originally created for man, and not only so, but so fashioned and adorned as that they should be in all respects the fittest of all possible dwelling-places for him, shall not be cast aside, as though, by Satan's enmity, they had become utterly vile and useless. They shall be new created. "Behold," says the Almighty, "I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind." (Isa. lxv. 17.) "As the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, so shall your end and your name remain." (Isa. lxvi. 22.) "And I saw," says the Apostle John, speaking of the same period, "a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven, and the first earth, were passed away. . . And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new." (Rev. xxi. 1, 5.) "Nevertheless," says the Apostle Peter, "we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." (2 Pet. iii. 13.) The distinguishing feature of this new state of things shall be that the curse, pronounced on the earth because of sin, shall be entirely removed. "There shall be no more curse," says the apostle, in the Apocalypse; and Zechariah, when prophesying of the same blessed time, uses the same expression, though in the English version it is translated "utter destruction." This curse, it would appear, has so affected the earth, that it can only be removed by fire. "The world that then was," says the Apostle Peter, "being overflowed with water, perished; but the heavens and earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire. In the day of God, the heavens, being on fire, shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat." (2 Pet. iii. 6, 7, 12.) This fact is urged by many, and with great vehemence, against the doctrine that the coming of Christ is before the millennium. "How," say they, "is it possible, if the coming of Christ is to be accompanied with such a conflagration as the Apostle Peter describes, that the nations who are to people the earth during the millennium can be preserved?" We admit that there is a difficulty; and for an answer to it, would refer to the full discussion of the subject at p. 218 of this Journal, which relieves us from the necessity of now resuming the subject. We may remark, however, that even if we were to grant to our opponents that the millennium

Digitized by Google

must precede that conflagration, which, according to Peter, is to usher in the new heavens and earth, we shall find that this scheme is by no means free from difficulties. Isaiah speaks of the new heavens and new earth in a way which cannot be easily reconciled with the idea of such an introductory conflagration as shall utterly destroy *all* that is in the earth. "Be ye glad, and rejoice for ever in that which I create, (the new heavens, &c., mentioned in the preceding verse,) for behold I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy. . . . There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days, for the child shall die a hundred years old, but the sinner being a hundred years old shall be accursed. They shall build houses, and inhabit them, and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw as the bullock, and dust shall be the serpent's meat." So plain is this, that one of the latest opponents of the pre-millennial advent asserts that the apostle's new earth and Isaiah's new earth, are not one and the same, but two different things, to be accomplished at two different times. According to him, what God means to announce in Isaiah's prediction is (I use his own language), "I am yet to put a new face upon the Church, and even here to put forth for her joyful renovation all the power to which she owes her creation." * "In Isaiah," he says, "nothing can be more evident than that the change immediately in view is a *moral* one, while Peter's detail . . . renders it quite clear that a *physical* renovation is what he intends." † But then Peter says expressly that it is *according to promise* that we look for a new heavens and a new earth; and the only place where they are mentioned is this passage of Isaiah. How then, if the prophet and the apostle intended different things and times, how could the *one* promise, what the *other* declared he expected? "But then," says the author to whom we refer, "the apostle's announcement is in the bosom of the prophet's, and Peter saw it there." We may confidently affirm that it is not to be found in the prophet's announcement, if his interpretation of that announcement be correct. Isaiah's language might be all fulfilled, and yet there might be no new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. We must candidly say, that this difficulty appears to us much more insurmountable than the former one which is urged against us. That difficulty just comes to this, whether it be possible for God to destroy the earth, and yet preserve the

* Brown, p. 208. † Ibid., p. 226.

Digitized by Google

seed of man. But this one is, whether the Word of God can tell us of a promise contained in a passage in which, according to the rule of interpretation pressed upon us, no such promise can be found to exist. God's power will remove the former difficulty—the latter impugns his faithfulness.

The earth then, thus renewed by fire, shall not, so far as the Scriptures teach us, be much altered in its outward features. There shall still be the diversified scenery of hill and dale, of mountains, rivers, and seas; and no doubt all in natural beauty that the eye of taste admires shall be met with there, in even greater perfection than now. The giant cedar, and the stately fir, the grey willow drooping over the stream, the white-blossomed almond, the umbrageous sycamore, and the graceful acacia, the green box, and the odorous myrtle, shall mingle the varied hues of their foliage; while the olive, the fig, the vine, and the rose, the special favourites of man, shall still cluster around his dwelling. "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad: let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof. Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein. Then shall all the *trees* of the wood rejoice before the Lord: for he cometh—he cometh to judge the earth. He shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth." (Ps. xcvi. 11—13.) "I will cause the shower to come down in his season, there shall be showers of blessing; and the tree of the field shall yield her fruit, and the earth shall yield her increase." (Ezek. xxxiv. 27.) "Be not afraid, ye beasts of the field, for the pastures of the wilderness do spring, for the tree beareth her fruit, the fig tree, and the vine, do yield their strength." (Joel ii. 22.) "Ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace: the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle tree, and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off." (Isa. lv. 12, 13.) The brute creation shall also participate in this glorious change. In what manner, or to what extent, shall be the renewal of their natures, it is of course impossible to say. There may be perhaps something figurative in the language employed on this subject by the prophets, but this much at least is apparent, that in the new heavens and new earth they shall be in the condition for which they were originally created—the same which they enjoyed in Eden before the fall. "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down

Digitized by Google

with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox, and the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." (Isa. xi. 6—9.)

Who, then, shall be the inhabitants of this renovated earth? They shall be the risen saints, and the Jewish and Gentile nations. "How unnatural the mixture!" some may be disposed to exclaim; "can we believe that those who have been raised from the grave, and those who are yet subject unto death, can inhabit the same world together?" The testimony of Scripture seems very decided upon this point, that there shall be on the earth during the millennial age, those who have not yet been delivered from death, and who shall be subject to the ordinary laws of mortal life. For Isaiah, in that very place which has been already quoted, when discoursing of the new heavens and earth, intimates, as appears to us very clearly, that death is not yet utterly abolished. "There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days, for the child shall die an hundred years old, and the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed. . . . As the days of a tree shall be the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands." (Isa. lxv. 20—22.) That is to say, for we can put no other meaning upon the words, the term of man's life shall be so prolonged as to be like the duration of a tree, which extends over several generations of the present race of men: and if one should in those days die at the age of a hundred years, he shall be counted as a child, or as one whom God, for his sins, hath cursed with premature death. Nay, the very fact that Death is not cast into the lake of fire till the end of the millennium—that it is the last enemy that shall be destroyed, seems conclusively to prove that its power shall not be entirely taken away at the opening of the millennial age. And moreover the prophet speaks of their building houses, and inhabiting them, of their planting vineyards, and eating the fruit of them, and of their offspring being blessed along with them—all which expressions seem necessarily to imply that they are still in a state of mortality. Then again, when we turn to Zechariah's description of the same millennial era, we find that every one that is left of all

Digitized by Google

the nations that came against Jerusalem, shall go up from year to year to keep the feast of tabernacles, and that those who refuse to come shall be punished by the withholding of rain from them. (Zech. xiv. 16.) "Many peoples," says Isaiah, "shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." (Isa. ii. 3.) We find also that in the vision of the New Jerusalem in the Apocalypse, predicting the glory of the risen saints, it is said, "The kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour unto it, and the glory and honour of the nations shall be brought unto it." (Rev. xxi. 24, 26.) Parallel to which passage is that other in the forty-fifth Psalm, in which, speaking of the Church as the bride of Christ, it is said, "Kings' daughters were among thy honourable women; the daughter of Tyre shall be there with a gift, even the rich among the people shall entreat thy favour." And lastly, the leaves of the tree of life which grows in the midst of the street of the New Jerusalem, are said to be for the *healing of the nations.* (Rev. xxii. 2.) From all which passages, we have no hesitation in coming to the conclusion, that there shall be kings and nations on the new earth, who shall not be delivered from the possibility of sinning, who shall need healing; and who, though the term of man's life shall be greatly prolonged, shall yet be subject unto death.

But what shall be the religious state of these nations? Their coming up to worship the Lord of hosts, their bringing their honour and glory unto him—their eating of the leaves of the tree of life, intimate very plainly that there shall be at least a universal *outward* obedience rendered to God during the millennium. In many cases, in the majority of cases—perhaps in all, there shall be the real conversion of the heart; for then shall be the day spoken of by Joel, when the Spirit of God shall be abundantly poured forth, and the means of grace increased. (Joel ii. 28, 29.) Then shall the people of God spring up as the grass, and as willows by the watercourses. (Isa. xliv. 4.) The work of effectual calling will then go on on a large scale. When the judgments of God are abroad on the earth, the inhabitants thereof shall learn righteousness; and most probably before the dawn of the millennial morn shall have given place to day, the knowledge of the Lord shall have covered the earth, even as the waters cover the channel of the deep. Yet let no man

Digitized by Google

presume upon this, to postpone hearkening *now* to the invitations of the Gospel. We have no reason to believe that any, who in the world that now is shall have put from them an offered Saviour, shall ever, in the world to come, have it in their power to embrace him. All such shall be swept away by God's just judgment upon the followers of Antichrist. The prediction of an apostasy at the close of the millennium has led many to suppose that the obedience rendered during that age by the nations, shall not be a hearty obedience, having its root in conversion, else, it is asked, whence should those come who take part in that final rebellion? No doubt the supposition that a portion of the earth's inhabitants only yield an outward homage to their heavenly King, does very easily account for an outbreak of disobedience, when Satan shall be loosed from his prison. Nor do we see sufficient data for pronouncing very decisively that this notion is erroneous. And yet, even though all the nations should be, at the opening of the millennium, converted unto God, we see no difficulty in finding the materials for a rebellion at its close. Though one generation of men should be converted, it does not follow that their successors must be converted too. The children of the saints are not always saints themselves. And thus, in a single generation, there might spring up a sufficient number of unconverted men to furnish the host of Satan for his last daring act of hostility against the Most High.

Having thus ascertained the scene of the dominion of the second Adam, namely, the new heavens and new earth; and having expounded the teaching of Scripture as to one part of its inhabitants, the nations who shall survive the destruction of Antichrist, we may pause to take a short survey of the elements of blessedness which shall belong to their state.

There shall then be peace on earth. "Come, behold the works of the Lord, what desolations he hath wrought in the midst of the earth. He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; he breaketh the bow, he cutteth the spear in sunder, he burneth the chariot in the fire." (Ps. xlvi. 8, 9.) The shaking of kingdoms shall have ceased—the overturning of thrones shall have come to an end—the heavings of the political ocean shall be stilled into a calm; the dire clashing of interests—the striving of rank with rank, of class with class, which has embittered this world's history ever since the iron was mixed with the miry clay, is now hushed for ever. The last of the four great empires shall have been broken in pieces by the stone cut out without hands, and the harmony

Digitized by Google

which empirics have looked for, each one in the fruit of the favourite nostrum which he strutted on the stage of politics to recommend to his fellow-men, shall then be found, where none of them all thought of looking for it—in the pages of Divine revelation, the principles of which shall then have been worked out by the hand of God himself. The tribes of earth, exhausted by their own vain struggles, shall welcome, oh, how gladly! this gift of their Creator; and recognising in the fearful fall of Antichrist, the smoke of whose burning shall still be ascending before them, the just judgment of an offended God, "they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." (Isa. ii. 4.) The spirit of the Gospel shall be universally diffused. Men shall do unto others as they would that they should do unto them; each shall love his neighbour as himself, and so shall it come to pass, in the language of the prophet, that every man shall dwell under his own vine and fig-tree, without any to make him afraid. "They shall not build and another inhabit, they shall not plant and another eat, for as the days of a tree are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands. They shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth for trouble, for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them." (Isa. lxv. 21—23.) Though sin shall not be utterly eradicated, the contest of the new man for superiority over it shall be far less arduous than now it is. Satan shall then have no access to the imagination to bewitch it with his sorceries. The communications of grace shall be more open and unrestrained than now they are. "It shall come to pass," saith the Almighty, "that *before* they call, I will answer, and while they are yet speaking I will hear." (Isa. lxv. 24.) And moreover, if our earth, even now, is so full of beauty—if from among the busy haunts of men the care-worn spirit finds relief in looking on its green hill-sides, its bosky dells, its cloud-capped mountains; in listening to the murmuring of its rills, the louder voice of its more mighty streams, or the thunderings of the measureless ocean, how much more shall these joys be enhanced, when the curse is removed and paradise restored!

We have placed first in order some of the blessings accruing to the nations of the earth from the restoration of all things, before passing to any consideration of the other inhabitants of the world to come, because, when we turn to contemplate the risen saints, and especially Him who sits

Digitized by Google

enthroned in the midst of them, the effulgence of glory which will meet our eyes might prevent us from discerning those minor sources of happiness, upon which nevertheless Scripture dwells, and which it would have been improper therefore to omit.

There are three great offices which in Scripture prophecy are destined for the Messiah, and which he shall assume, in all their fulness, in the millennial age. He is the second Adam—He is the King of the Jews—He is the head of his body, the Church. Of these the first is the principal, and the other two are subsidiary to its full development. When Antichrist, the usurper, hath been overthrown, the Redeemer will appear as the head of the redeemed creation, and all things shall be put under His feet. But at the same time when the Lord shall appear in his glory, then shall he build up Zion, and reign as king before His ancients gloriously. Our space will not permit us to refer at any length to the restoration of Israel—a subject so copiously handled by all the ancient prophets. We shall content ourselves with giving a brief view of what Scripture seems to teach, arranging the details, so far as we can, in historical order. Few, comparatively, will deny that there is to be *any* restoration of the Jews, nor would there probably be any who would do so, were it not for the prejudice that subsists against the doctrine of a pre-millennial advent. Dr. Whitby, a decided anti-millenarian, says, in his commentary on Rom. xi., that the conversion and restoration of the Jews "hath been the constant doctrine of the Church of Christ, owned by all the Greek and Latin Fathers, and by ALL commentators he has met with on this place." This testimony may relieve us from any necessity of referring to the opinions of former commentators, and we shall at once proceed to the statements of Scripture. It appears then from the thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth chapters of Ezekiel, that previously to the advent of Christ, Israel shall have returned to Palestine in an unconverted state, that they shall be dwelling there in peace and security, when a multitude of nations (Gog, Magog, and Ros are the names by which the prophet designates them) shall come up against them. This is evidently the same time that is spoken of in the prophecy of Zechariah, (chap. xiv.,) when he says that the Lord will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle, and half the city shall be taken. But in the very moment of their apparent success, Christ himself shall interpose for the salvation of his people. "Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those nations, as when

Digitized by Google

he fought in the day of battle. And his feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east. . . . And the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee." There is also a note given us by Ezekiel, by which we may find the place of these events in the Apocalyptic visions. In the day when Gog and Magog are overthrown, God prepares a sacrifice upon the mountains of Israel, for every feathered fowl, and every beast of the field. (Ezek. xxxix. 17.) We find the same event in the xixth chapter of Revelation. An angel cries with a loud voice to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven. "Come and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God, that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and captains, and mighty men, and horses, and them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, free and bond, small and great." In this case, it is the host of Antichrist; the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, that are mustered to the battle of Armaggedon; so that we may conclude that this expedition of Antichrist, and the invasion of Gog and Magog, and Zechariah's siege of Jerusalem, are one and the same; to be utterly terminated by the personal appearance of the Messiah. Then shall Israel be converted. "It shall come to pass in that day, that I will seek to destroy all nations that come against Jerusalem: and I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications, and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and shall mourn because of him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born." (Zech. xii. 9, 10.) Then shall be fulfilled that which is written:—"The sons of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee; and all they that dispersed thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet, and they shall call thee the city of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel." (Isa. lx. 14.) "Then shall they serve the Lord, and David their king, whom he shall raise up unto them. For he shall set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even his servant David. I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David shall be a prince among them; I the Lord have spoken it." (Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24.) "The Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day there shall be one Lord, and his name one." (Zech. xiv. 9.) We abstain from noticing the many promises of glory belonging to this period, for our limits will not permit us to dwell upon them, and we conclude this portion of our subject with

Digitized by Google

the remark that David, or *the beloved one*, must necessarily be Christ, the son of David, he who was the king of the Jews, who has never resigned his right, nor given his sceptre to another.

When Christ shall come the second time, many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall wake. All his saints shall he bring with him. Thus he shows himself to be the head of his body the Church, and the firstborn from the dead. "Christ the first-fruits, afterward, they that are Christ's, at his coming." He will bring them with him when he gathers Israel, and comes to rule the converted nations. But how shall all these dwell together? Can men in their mortal state, and those who have been raised immortal and incorruptible, hold fellowship upon earth? Why not? Has not earth already been trod by angels' feet? Did not God himself hold converse with Abraham, at his tent-door, under the oak at Mamre? When Christ arose, did not many of the saints that slept arise with him, and enter into the holy city, and were seen of many? Did not Christ himself many times hold intercourse with his disciples after the resurrection? Did he not eat and drink with them? And how, then, can any say that such converse is impossible in the world that is to come? Such intercourse may be, and yet there may be peculiar blessings reserved for those who have finished their course and are partakers of the first resurrection. We may not be able to explain all the details by which this intercourse shall be regulated. God has not seen fit to reveal them. But it were a most unjustifiable conclusion, that because the details are not understood, the fact must be denied. Everywhere in the universe of God there are ranks and degrees. Among angels there is a hierarchy. In the resurrection state, one star differeth from another in glory. In the world to come, there are those that rule, and those that are ruled. Christ over all, for the sceptre of his kingdom is a right sceptre; the apostles sitting on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel; the resurrection saints also enthroned. "Thou hast made us kings and priests unto our God, and we shall reign on the earth." (Rev. v. 10.) And lastly, the kings and nations of the earth bringing their honour and glory unto the Lamb. Is there no harmony here in this subordination? Is there no joy to arise out of this meeting of the saints? Surely, the interchange of thoughts and feelings among those who have completed their time of trial, and entered into their reward, will be abundantly delightful. Shall Adam have no story to

Digitized by Google

unfold of redeeming love? Shall Enoch not tell us of his walk with God, while he looked steadily forward to the promise, that the Lord should come with ten thousand of his saints? There, too, shall Noah be, to tell of a world destroyed by water; and Moses, of his wanderings in the Arabian deserts; and David, to add something of richness to his experience already recorded in the Psalms; and Ezra, Nehemiah, and Zerubbabel, the heroes of the return from Babylon; and Paul, wearing the crown so long reserved for him. Time would fail to speak of Mary, and Lazarus, of Zaccheus, and Nicodemus, and Joseph of Arimathea, and of the thief upon the cross, that most memorable instance of the power of grace. Above all, and in the midst of all, taking them into closest companionship, and shedding on them the full effulgence of his glorified countenance, shall be Jesus, who trod the same path of sorrow and of suffering, looking to the joy set before him. Angels, in number ten thousand times ten thousand, shall minister unto them, and ever and anon the jubilant anthem shall arise from all creation; for now, all the seals are opened, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God. Wide abroad, over the glad converted lands, shall the skirts of that glory spread. And if, like the disciples on the mount of transfiguration, the yet unglorified inhabitants of earth shall not be capable of bearing this excess of brightness, is it too much to suppose that there shall be times and seasons when the dwellers in the New Jerusalem, yea, even their King himself, shall veil somewhat the radiance of their immortal state, to encourage, cheer, comfort, and console, those who are still waiting to enter into their rest? The language of the apostle, in the epistle to the Hebrews, shall then receive a new meaning. Visibly shall they be compassed about with a mighty cloud of witnesses, who have fought their fight, and kept the faith. From their own lips shall they hear the story of their struggles, their victory, and their reward. The tidings of the city of salvation shall be borne to them by angelic messengers, who shall proclaim: "Ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel."

Digitized by Google

(Heb. xii. 22—24.) Happy shall be the pilgrim, whose lot it shall be to journey Zionward in such days as these! Happier still shall those be, whose pilgrimage is accomplished, and who are sitting at the table of the Redeemer, and drinking with him the new wine of the kingdom!

But let us now turn our attention to some passages of Scripture which receive a new light from this doctrine, and in their turn reflect some light on it. The renovation of the earth is indissolubly connected with the coming of the Messiah. "Repent, and be converted," said Peter to the Jews, "that your sins may be blotted out, when (literally, that) the times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord; and he may send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts iii. 19.) The times of refreshing, and the times of the restoration of all things, are plainly one and the same, and they are times which have been spoken of by all the holy prophets since the world began. They are evidently, then, the times of the new heavens and earth. Then the hot atmosphere of strife and debate shall give place to the cooling breeze of the resurrection morn; then shall the Church be refreshed, for she shall come to meet her Lord in the dew of her youth; then shall Israel be refreshed, for their enemies having been destroyed, they shall dwell every man under his own vine and fig-tree; then shall creation be refreshed, for the time of her deliverance from the curse shall have arrived, and all things shall be made new. And it is important to observe, that two things are mentioned as preliminaries to the coming of these times,—the conversion of Israel, and the sending of Christ from heaven. This passage, then, in its natural acceptation, entirely bears out the doctrines on which we have been insisting, and the difficulty which commentators have found in explaining it upon any other hypothesis, is, as we think, a strong corroboration of the truth of these doctrines.

Another most important passage bearing upon this subject is to be found in Rom. viii. 19—23. "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject unto vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole

Digitized by Google

creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." The text now quoted has been the cause of much perplexity to commentators, and this very fact will strongly confirm the truth of the views we have been expounding, when it is found, that, if these are adopted, we may put upon it the plainest and most obvious sense which the words will bear. Observe, then, that the "creature" is here distinguished from "the sons of God." "The earnest expectation of the *creature* waiteth for the manifestation of the *sons of God.*" It is distinguished also from those who have the first-fruits of the Spirit: "The whole creation (or, every creature) groaneth . . . and not only *they*, but *ourselves* also, which *have the first-fruits of the Spirit*, even *we* groan." Now as the wicked are neither earnestly looking for the manifestation of the sons of God, nor shall be delivered from corruption, the only meaning we can attach to the word "creature" is, "the whole frame of created things," all that hath been, since the fall, subjected unto the curse by Adam's sin. This creation, or lower world, is to be delivered from the bondage of corruption at the time of the manifestation of the sons of God. This can only mean at the resurrection, when Christ shall bring with him his glorified saints. And this is made still more plain by what follows. "Even we ourselves, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit (*i.e.*, we who are believers), groan within ourselves," we participate in the sorrows and travailing of the whole creation, "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." But the adoption of the body, the redemption of the body, can only be the resurrection, and if for it the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth, then shall that expectation be fully realized when God shall make all things new.

To one other passage we must allude. "Ye who have followed me," says our Lord, "in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye shall also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." (Matt. xix. 28.) How plain is this promise, interpreted according to the views we have been inculcating! The regeneration is the new creation, the world to come. The Son of man shall then sit on the throne of his glory, as the second Adam. The tribes of Israel shall then be gathered and converted, and it shall be the prerogative of the apostles,

Digitized by Google

when raised from the dead, to be vicegerents for him in exercising his royal power over the seed of Abraham.

The blessedness of this rule of the Messiah over the risen saints, restored Israel, and the whole creation, is the favourite theme of the prophets, and especially, as indeed was seemly, of David himself. From what point soever of the world's history their predictions may commence,—however wailing their strains may be, when depicting intervening woes,—the harp is never laid down till all its chords have rung out in jubilant symphony to the glories of the shepherd-king of Israel. "Give the king thy judgments, O God, and thy righteousness unto the king's son. He shall judge thy people with righteousness, and thy poor with judgment. . . . He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass: like showers that water the earth. In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth. He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him; and his enemies shall lick the dust. The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents: the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts." (Ps. lxxii.) "And there shall come forth a rod from the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, nor reprove after the hearing of his ears: but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked one. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins." (Isa. xi. 1—5.) "And he shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God; and they shall abide: for now shall he be great unto the ends of the earth." (Micah v. 4.) "O sing unto the Lord a new song; for he hath done marvellous things: his right hand, and his holy arm, hath gotten him the victory. The Lord hath made known his salvation: his righteousness hath he openly shewed in the sight of the heathen. He hath remembered his mercy and his truth toward the house of Israel: all the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God. Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all the earth: make a

Digitized by Google

loud noise, and rejoice, and sing praise. Sing unto the Lord with the harp; with the harp, and the voice of a psalm. With trumpets and sound of cornets make a joyful noise before the Lord, the King. Let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein. Let the floods clap their hands: let the hills be joyful together before the Lord; for he cometh to judge the earth: with righteousness shall he judge the world, and the people with equity." (Ps. xcviii.)

In these, and in many other similar passages which might be quoted, there is one peculiar characteristic of Messiah's reign which is always insisted on,—the justice and the equity of his rule. Nor is this a mere abstract attribute of the reign of the Just One;—the meek of the earth, the poor and the needy, the widow and fatherless, are the peculiar objects of his care. This of itself ought to be a satisfactory proof that it is no celestial kingdom over which he reigns. The principles of his rule are indeed heavenly, but the locality is upon the earth. The kingdoms of the great image which Daniel saw are broken and carried away as dust from the summer thrashing-floor, but their place is occupied by the great mountain which fills the whole earth. The wild beasts have judgment executed on them, but the scene is not changed: one like unto the Son of man receives from the Ancient of days a kingdom that shall never pass away. And how forcibly does the fact, that the justice and equity of Messiah's reign are the characteristics on which the prophets most constantly dwell,—how forcibly does this testify to the essential tyranny of all human government, and the essential iniquity of all human legislation! No wonder is it that scattered fragments of these ancient strains should have been eagerly caught up by the poets of other lands, and should have suggested to them some of their loveliest and sublimest thoughts, when in the midst of idolatry, corruption, and licentiousness, they sung, in borrowed language which tradition had preserved, of the return of the golden age, which they mysteriously associated with the incarnation of the Divinity. Deal not with these vague anticipations as though they were the errors of Paganism,—they were rather scintillations from the altar-fire of truth divine,—instances of the earnest expectation of the creature for some better thing than can be here enjoyed. It is true, it was a mere fancy of their own which they cherished. The unregenerate heart cannot discern, nor can it love the truth. Where God has set a light, it prefers to walk in

Digitized by Google

sparks of its own kindling, a faint and foolish imitation of the illumination that cometh from on high. Let us, who possess the purer light of revelation, beware how we accept our own fancies instead of it, and, by a more pitiable delusion than that of the heathen, blot out from our map of the future the very glories which God has placed there, and which have been the consolation of the faithful in the ages that are passed. David rejoiced to see the day of Christ: it was often the theme of his inspired song; but never did he sing of it so clearly or so sweetly as when about to lay aside his harp for ever:—

Saith David the son of Jesse,
And saith the warrior exalted on high,
Anointed of the God of Jacob,
And the sweet psalmist of Israel.
"The spirit of Jehovah speaketh by me,
And his word is on my tongue.
Saith the God of Israel;
To me speaketh the Rock of Israel:
There shall rule over men the Righteous One,
Ruling in the fear of God:
As the light of the morning, Jehovah shall arise,
The sun of a morning without clouds,
By his brightness after the rain the herbage springeth from the earth." (2 Sam. xxiii. 1—4.)

The question no doubt will recur to the minds of some, even after all the evidence which has been adduced, how can these things be? We have already shown that there is nothing contrary to the teaching of Scripture, or the analogy of faith, in believing that the world to come shall be the eternal habitation of the blessed. We have also endeavoured to prove that there is nothing inconsistent with the majesty and glory of the Redeemer, in believing that where *they* are, he shall be also. So much is indeed granted to us by many of our opponents. Moreover, some considerations have been adduced to show that intercourse and companionship between the risen saints on the one hand, and mortal men on the other, hath in it nothing so monstrous or incredible, as that the notion should be at once thrust aside, without further examination; and thus we conclude that Jehovah-Jesus may reign on earth, in the midst of his risen saints, and before his ancients gloriously, while at the same time the subjects of his rule are the nations, not as yet entirely delivered from the fruits of Adam's sin. Yet it is impossible to avoid perceiving that there is in the minds of most men a prejudice,

Digitized by Google

perhaps a natural prejudice, against the idea of Christ thus reigning over a community, all of whom are not advanced to the final stage of perfection, as though it involved somewhat degrading to him.

It may, perhaps, tend to remove this prejudice, if it be kept in mind that there is no warrant given by Scripture for endeavouring to specify minute details regarding the mode of the Redeemer's reign. Some have attempted this, but as we think very presumptuously. For ought that we can tell, the New Jerusalem may be akin to the shekinah, or cloud of Divine glory, by which God in old time revealed his presence. In this glory Christ shall come—to this glory his saints shall be caught up; and it may be that this manifestation of Christ in the midst of his glorified Church, shall remain throughout the millennial age, an overshadowing tabernacle for his redeemed Israel beneath. Or, if the New Jerusalem be actually a terrestrial city, then let it be noted that Ezekiel distinctly speaks of two cities to be built in the Holy Land in these days. One he saw on the south of the mountain on which he stood, and in it was the temple which he was told to measure. The other was in the centre of the Holy Land, twenty miles distant from the sanctuary. One of these cities has certain strong points of resemblance to the New Jerusalem of the Apocalypse, the figure of the polity of the resurrection Church; while the other is in many points different from it. In the one there is a temple; in the other the apostle saw no temple, for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb were the temple of it. In the one the light of the sun was sevenfold; the other had no need of the sun, neither of the moon to shine in it, for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. In the one, waters of healing go forth from the threshold of the temple; in the other, the true water of life flows from the throne of God. In the one, all trees grow for meat; in the other, the tree of life is for the healing of the nations. The contrast might be pursued further, but it is unnecessary. Thus, upon either the one supposition or the other, the scene of the glory of the second Adam may be removed from the rest of the inhabitants of the world, so as to prevent that contact which some think so unbecoming. The place where he reigns in the midst of his risen saints may be inaccessible to those who have not partaken of the first resurrection. And yet Christ may, from time to time, manifest himself even unto them in a manner suited to their more feeble nature. There may be the same difference between his revelation of himself

Digitized by Google

to his risen saints, and to the other inhabitants of the world to come, as there was between his manifestation of himself to his disciples on the mount of transfiguration, and his manifestation of himself to the same disciples after his resurrection. His glory was veiled in the latter case; in the former it shone forth in all its transcendant brilliancy. But we dare not any further meddle with this sublime topic. Even in what has been said, we may have gone beyond what is written. One thing at least is certain, that in those days the tabernacle of God shall be with men, and he shall dwell among them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and shall be their God.

Art. IV.—THE DISPENSATION OF THE FULNESS OF TIMES.

The critical accuracy is not to be despised as little or unworthy, which aims at ascertaining not only the general import of each Divinely-indited sentence, but likewise, if possible, the precise idea attaching to each Divinely-indited word. Indeed, accuracy of verbal interpretation is absolutely necessary to determine even the general drift of much that is written; and it were an easy, though not a grateful task, to illustrate the justness of this statement, by adducing many instances of erroneous exposition, attributable to nothing whatever but the want of verbal accuracy. A great man,* a man too great to despise in any department what he himself would have termed "the power of littles," was wont to observe that if, on any subject, Paul deemed it worth his while to pen a clause, surely on that subject a minister should think it worth his while to preach a sermon. It may justly be added, that every word which God has seen fit to employ in giving us a revelation of His will, deserves to be examined by us with devout reverence and attention, especially if it be a word which has important bearings on the passage to which it belongs. Nor will such an examination ever be unrewarded. It will contribute, in every instance, some measure of aid towards a right interpretation; and, in the case of such words as have a leading significance, may serve to throw light, not only on the passage immediately under review, but likewise on many kindred portions of Divine truth. One leading word, rightly uptaken, may give

* The late Dr. Chalmers.

Digitized by Google

the careful student possession of a generic thought that will gather illustrations around it from all quarters of Scripture, and be, as it were, a centre of attraction to many loose particles of truth that are floating to and fro confusedly in the mind.

These remarks may seem foreign to the subject announced at the head of this article, but we have been led into them naturally enough by the course of our meditations on that very subject. We apprehend that *dispensation*, or *economy*, for the words are identical in meaning, is generally used, as a theological term, with greater latitude than the Scripture application of it warrants. A less arbitrary use of it,—one more exactly conformed to Scripture precedent, would afford a correct, as well as comprehensive, principle, for the classification of God's dealings with our world, and prevent much loose speculation, perhaps much barren controversy.

The word referred to is employed only once in the New Testament to denominate a distinct period of the world's history; but an examination of the passage in which it occurs will enable us, without much difficulty, to ascertain the idea there attached to it, and the characteristic features of the period which it designates. The passage is as follows: —"Having made known unto us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure, which He hath purposed in Himself, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth." * The Greek word, here rendered *dispensation*, literally signifies *stewardship*, and in that signification it is repeatedly used in Scripture,—most frequently to denote the ministerial charge, or the *stewardship*, intrusted by God to the preacher of the Gospel; as, for example, when it is said, "*a dispensation* of the Gospel is committed unto me;" † and "if ye have heard of the *dispensation* of the grace of God, which is given me to youward." ‡ In this its proper and more common scriptural acceptation, the word involves the ideas of delegated authority and responsible trust. These ideas are not excluded from the meaning of the word, as it is employed in the passage before us. Indeed they constitute the essential and generic portion of its meaning, wheresoever it is used in the New Testament. "The dispensation of the fulness of times" is just, in other terms, the delegated administration, or government, of the fulness of times; or, by an obvious and common transition, the period during which that administration, or government,

* Eph. i. 9, 10. † 1 Cor. ix. 17. ‡ Eph. iii. 2.

Digitized by Google

exists. To determine the peculiar nature of the economy, or administration, referred to, we must consult the statement made by the apostle regarding it. "'*Ανακεφαλαιωσασθαι τα παντα ἐν τῳ Χριστῳ*," is the explanatory language which he uses. It means, according to the English version, "that he might gather together in one (*i.e.*, concentrate under the rule or government of one head) all things in Christ." "It seemed good to the Lord in his infinite wisdom," says Owen, "* * * to appoint one common heir, head, ruler, and lord to them both (*i.e.*, to both men and angels,) and this was the Son, as the apostle tells us, (Eph. i. 10:) 'He gathered together in one all things in Christ, both which are in the heavens, and which are in the earth, even in Him.' He designed, *ἀνακεφαλαιωσασθαι*, 'to bring all into one Head,' and rule in Him. It is not a similitude taken from casting up accounts, wherein lesser sums are in the close brought into one head, as some have imagined;—nor yet an allusion to orators, who, in the close of their long orations, sum up the matter they have at large treated of,—that the apostle makes use of; both which are beneath the majesty of, and no way suited to illustrate, the matter he hath in hand. But, as Chrysostom well intimates on the place, it is as if he had said, *μιαν κεφαλην ἁπασιν ἐπεθηκε*, 'He appointed one head to them all,' angels and men, with whatsoever in the just constitution of the Divine government was subordinate unto them." * Christ's government, then, or his headship over creation, is the grand characteristic feature which marks the dispensation of the fulness of times, or, as it may be termed, the Messianic economy. That the dispensation did not begin before the incarnation of our Lord is evident from the manner in which it is spoken of by the apostle; besides, though unquestionably the Lord acted throughout all preceding ages with a reference to the character in which he was afterwards to appear, yet it was not till he actually appeared in that character, and formally claimed as his own the government of the world, that the dispensation could properly be said to take its commencement. On the other hand, the commencement of the dispensation cannot be postponed to the date of the incarnation. No sooner had that marvellous event set an historic seal to the announcement of ancient prophecy, "Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given," than the government was, *de jure*, or by God's act of devolution, laid on the shoulder of Christ, and the economy of the

* Exp. Ep. Heb. cap. i.

Digitized by Google

fulness of times thus put in movement. Who can deny that Christ was born a king? Or that he came into the world as the second Adam, head over creation? He appeared, it is true, and that *for great reasons of state,* if the expression may be used, in a condition of deepest abasement; He was so disguised that there was scarcely one who could "declare His generation" as the eternal Son; yet He spoke with authority as one who was conscious of universal Lordship, and had claims on universal loyalty. His claims were not recognised, except by a few who had been waiting for him, as the consolation of Israel; and till this day they have never been recognised except by the election of grace: but want of recognition cannot divest him of his authority, nor abolish his claims. We therefore maintain that ever since the day of the incarnation, or the day when Christ began to exist in a condition of God-manhood, the dispensation of the fulness of times has been running its course.

The government will be for ever on Christ's shoulder; therefore the dispensation, which has already begun, will never terminate. In the proper and scriptural sense of the expression, there can never be another economy than that on which we have already entered. *In so far as true dispensational elements are concerned,* we have been cast on times destined to be eternal. There will—there must be changes. Owing to the general, the well-nigh universal non-recognition of Christ's headship, it is necessary that unexampled changes—changes subversive of the whole apparent order of things, should take place, in order to unfold the real nature of this dispensation, and win for the great truths which form the basis of it, the willing acknowledgment of the world. Who, passing his eye over the face of the nations, would infer from what he sees the real nature of the economy under which he lives, or that the throne of earth as well as of heaven belongs even now, by right, to the Lord Jesus? Those who labour under a total ignorance of Christ's name are numbered by hundreds of millions. Most of the nations which have easy access to the means of Gospel-enlightenment, have spurned from them the yoke of subjection to Christ's authority; and the rest have, with a Judas-like embrace—a hollow show of friendly acknowledgment, betrayed his cause. Do the statistics of the world *seem* to argue the present existence and ongoing of a very different dispensation from that which has the delegation of all rule to Christ for its basis? They argue, *in fact,* nothing else than the rebellion of the nations against Christ's rightful government, and, consequently, the

Digitized by Google

need of unexampled—overwhelming changes to secure for his government the homage of universal recognition. The present face of things is such as to obscure the glory of the eternal dispensation that is in progress; nor will the obscuration cease till the world, that now is, be dissolved, and all things, by a creative, or regenerative, process, be made new. Then will the dispensation, emerging from its long eclipse, unfold its predicted glories, and the wheels of its Divine machinery be seen in free, untrammelled, and resistless movement. Let not the *prestige* of stupendous coming change create the idea that yet another economy must be ushered in upon the theatre of creation. Heaven and earth may pass away, but the economy that now exists, identified as it is with Christ's headship, shall never pass away.

But let us turn our eye in the opposite direction along the stream of time; let us look backward upon the ages that preceded the Incarnation, and see what other economy, if any, then sped through its briefer cycle. If the generic character of what in Scripture is called an economy, or dispensation, be, as we hold it is, government delegated to one who is constituted, either in a more or less limited sense, the Head of creation—then it is evident that from the beginning of the world, till the first coming of our Lord, there was only one dispensation that, with its specific differences, possessed the same general character as that of the fulness of times. We refer to the period during which Adam was clothed with authority, as head over all things in this lower world. That period formed the dispensation, as it may be called, of the beginning of time; and while time was still only in its beginning, that primary dispensation was, through the illapse of sin, precipitated to a close. The interval between the fall and the incarnation, between the ruin of the first, and the appearing of the second Adam, does not, in its whole history, present any distinct order of things which might, with scriptural propriety, be termed a dispensation. There was doubtless a peculiar form of government set up during the interregnum; the administration of affairs was intrusted to the angels of heaven, and especially during the Mosaic period, as Scripture abundantly testifies; but the angels were not placed in a relation of headship towards men, such as was occupied once by the first Adam, and is now occupied by the second; therefore their exercise of government did not possess a true dispensational character. They were not constituted lords of creation, so far as appears from Scripture, but were rather ministers of state, who stood

Digitized by Google

before the throne of Jehovah, and were, for a season, charged by him with the functions of executive government.

The long interval was occupied in making manifest the utter failure and irretrievable ruin of the Adamic economy, as well as in making due and orderly preparation for the inbringing of. another, that was to be everlasting. We do not well, or according to the conditions of a right classification of time, when we speak of the antediluvian, the patriarchal, and the Mosaic ages, as each forming a distinct economy. The history of these ages does, in fact, exhibit nothing of a dispensational kind, except merely the commingling shadows flung across, or in opposite directions, of one dispensation for ever ended, and of another not yet begun. Every event in that long period of history was either a consequence of the fall, a part of the *debris* of a former economy, or a prefiguration and earnest of the day, when a second economy, or headship-form of government, more secure and firmly consolidated, was to be set up in the world. Non-scriptural usage has so stereotyped the expression, that it is now difficult to avoid speaking of the Mosaic in contradistinction to the Christian dispensation, as if the periods referred to were characterized by two several forms of government, having distinctive peculiarities, but generically the same; whereas we ought to consider the Mosaic age, or system, not as a dispensation at all, but merely as a shadow of the dispensation that was approaching. Whatever in the Mosaic institutes had a dispensational aspect did not exhibit that aspect because it possessed in itself, intrinsically, or really, a dispensational character, but solely because it was representative, or typical, of the Messianic economy. The moment of the fall leaves us, so to speak, without dispensational ground whereon to stand; we are flung forthwith upon revolutionary or transition times—we are involved in the wreck of old creation; everything around us is collapsed and ruinous: chaos resumes its ancient reign—and, once more, all things are "without form and void." God's Sabbath is interrupted; again He arises to work, and to make all things new. Meanwhile no proper headship, or dispensational government, obtains; a provisional and temporary administration, under different outward forms, is established, and so things continue till what may be termed descriptively the sixth day of new creation arrives. Then Christ, the second Adam, is miraculously formed in the womb of a virgin; a new economy, infinitely better and greater than the first, is consequently brought in; the government is laid upon

Digitized by Google

Christ's shoulder, and headship given to him over all in heaven as well as on earth.

The dispensation of the fulness of times, then, was not preceded by any order of things possessing a proper dispensational character, except the Adamic, which was only of very brief duration; and it never will—we must for a moment recall the attention of our readers to the fact—be superseded by any other dispensational system. No changes, however great, that may yet set in upon the tide of time will shake or undermine its God-laid foundations. In its grand, generic principles, it will endure throughout eternity. The millennial age will, in no true dispensational element, differ from the evangelistic age that is now revolving. Our brethren, whether pre-millenarian or holding opposite views, who speak of *the thousand years* as a new dispensational era, we are far from being disposed to charge with rashness, but we are persuaded that they use the term dispensation in an improper sense. The improper,—we mean the non-scriptural use of a leading word may lay the soundest and most solid doctrine open to unmerited blame, and groundless suspicion. So it is in the present instance. There are men who shrink with exceeding nervousness from the doctrine of our Lord's pre-millennial advent, under the apprehension that the doctrine referred to sweeps away the economy of grace altogether, and brings in an economy of a wholly different kind. Let these men not tremble, as they do, for the ark of God; the name of our coming Saviour is not *Ichabod.* The glory will not depart when He comes, far less because of His coming into our world,—His world and ours. The grace that reigns now will continue to reign then; then will the outgoings of grace be more abundant, and its triumphs more illustrious than now.

But what shall we say of those who, either rash and ungenerous in statement, or incapable of viewing, at the same moment, a complex truth under more than one of its many different aspects, charge us with the monstrous error, the gross materialism of holding that conversion-work is to be effected during millennial times by the mere physical presence of Christ, and no longer by the operation of the Holy Spirit? On what ground do they prefer against us this hideous charge? What necessary connexion is there between the personal presence of our blessed Lord, and the supersession of the Spirit from that office which he now executes in the earth? What logical connexion is there between the two terms of the imagined sequence? What

Digitized by Google

connexion in the nature of things? If there be such a connexion, *we* cannot perceive it. If *they* can, let them show what it is—let them prove its existence—let them persuade us that it exists, and we shall abandon the hope of a pre-millennial advent at once and altogether. But so long as we see existing in the nature of things a most perfect compatibility between the Lord's personal, or manifest reign, and the Spirit's continued operation; so long, moreover, as we find it clearly declared in the Word of God, that the dispensation of the Spirit, as some are pleased to call it, will not give its richest outpourings of grace till after the advent of the Lord, so long, by the good hand of God upon us, shall we maintain our pre-millennial hope, and endeavour to make our brethren around us sharers of its blessedness, unmoved by the odious charges which may be fastened upon it by the ignorance of some, and by the ungenerosity of others. To a certain extent these charges may be precluded by letting it be known, that, according to the scriptural use of the term, we look for no other dispensation than the present. Is it a dispensation of grace *now?* So it will be after the appearing of our great God and Saviour. Is it a dispensation of the Spirit *now?* So it will be during the thousand years. The Advent will even usher in the spring-tide of the dispensation, as regards its element of grace, no less than as regards its other necessary elements. Then windows will be opened in heaven, and blessing be poured out so abundantly that there shall not be room enough to receive it. The Spirit shall be poured out from on high, and "the wilderness shall be a fruitful field, and the fruitful field shall be counted for a forest."

The eternal duration, speaking prospectively, of the very economy that is now running its course, is so far from being admitted by some of our brethren, that they regard the present economy as merely parenthetical. They evidently assume a dispensational basis, which we believe to have no scriptural warrant. If the scriptural basis be, as we hold, the principle of creation-headship; and if Christ be now, by God's appointment, the head of creation, then clearly the period between Christ's resurrection and his second advent is so far from being parenthetical, or interruptive, that it belongs, as a necessary and integral portion, to the dispensation of the fulness of times. There being only two dispensations, based on the principle of creation-headship, namely, the Adamic and the Messianic, whatever is inserted as parenthetical, should be inserted somewhere during the interval

Digitized by Google

between the close of the former, and the commencement of the latter of these dispensations. During the continuance of either, no room can be found for the introduction of anything parenthetical, expletive, or extraneous. Were anything of that kind introduced, it would necessarily suspend the existence of the established or current economy; in other words, it would supersede, for an interval, the existing Head of creation from his right of government; but the right referred to, after being once conferred, and so long as it has not been forfeited, cannot possibly be, even for a brief interval, superseded, or thrown into abeyance; and, therefore, the insertion of a parenthetical dispensation is impossible.

Some seem to be of the opinion, that all pre-millennialism labours under the vicious necessity of putting these Gospel-times within brackets,—of making the present age a mere parenthesis in the world's history. They have conceived this idea apparently from the fact that pre-millennialism does not converge the rays of Old Testament prophecy to a focus in the age preceding the Advent, but, scattering them over that age, carries their full concentrated light forward to millennial times. Can the brethren, referred to, hold that the dispensation, which is now in progress, will endure throughout all ages?—or even hold that, in a maturer form, it is to continue during the thousand years? If they do, how can they reasonably expect that Old Testament prophecy, sweeping as it does over the breadth of the dispensation, will dwell with as much minuteness of detail on its early and preliminary stage as on the period of its consummate and full-formed ripeness? Nothing could be more unreasonable than such an expectation. The Messianic economy being already begun, and destined to continue, though in a better-developed form, after the Advent, we may expect to find the predictions of the Old Testament regarding it gliding rapidly along its earlier course, and pouring, for the most part, their full tide upon the palmier days of its history. Had the present economy been radically different from that of coming ages, there is reason to believe that it would have stood more prominently out, and with stronger marks of discrimination, than it actually does, on the roll of ancient prophecy: but the present economy being the last,—the days in which we live being only the threshold, or porch of this eternal economy, it is not to be wondered at, if ancient prophecy, instead of tarrying long with us on the threshold or in the porch, should delight in carrying us forward into the midst

Digitized by Google

of the temple and in spreading out the glories of it before our eyes. No one can say that this Gospel era is omitted or overlooked. The predictions of the Old Testament tell of the sufferings of Christ as well as of the glory that was to follow; they point to the days, that are even now passing, as well as to happier times. Yet they attest their divine authorship by glancing more hastily across this dark and struggling interval,—by dwelling more at large amidst the glories and triumphs of the dispensation. What is imperfect and temporary, is distinctly, yet for the most part more cursorily, adverted to;—what is mature and terminating, is the subject of full and minute prediction.

Man, occupying this passing moment, as a central point of observation, sees most distinctly, and is, therefore, prone to attach more than its relative importance, to the part of the dispensation which lies immediately around him. In the distance, objects, though vaster than those in the foreground, bulk less, and glimmer out more obscurely before his eye. To the study of revelation he carries along with him his ill-proportioned view and imperfect measurement of things; and he seizes upon whatever in prophecy is most prominent and clear, as having almost unquestionably received its fulfilment in what is most clear and prominent within the field of his own observation. The divine is thus forced into agreement with the human, and *à priori* impressions take the place of that sound knowledge which nothing but a patient inductive analysis of the Word can bestow. God's point of view and God's field of observation are vastly different from man's. He sees everything at once in its proper form and magnitude,—He knows the end from the beginning,—His eye rests not on things in their imperfect state, but glances forward to their ripeness and consummation. Let us not, then, expect to find prophecies, the object of which is to give a well-proportioned view of the *whole* Messianic dispensation, occupied especially with details relating to *the present stage* of the dispensation,—a stage of it which is merely initial and preliminary. Let us expect to be borne along by them, as in the drift of a rapid current, over present times into the midst of those that are to witness a full realization or bodying forth of God's dispensational purposes. It is enough that in ever-recurring statement or allusion, these prophecies be found to give clear and precise views as to the characteristics of the present era; and it is no just cause for astonishment that they are, in the main, conversant with the events of a yet future day.

Digitized by Google

Let us illustrate the point in hand. The redemption of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage, their progress through the wilderness, and their settlement in the land of promise, afford a typical view of the Church's history. The period of Israel's sojourn in the wilderness corresponds to the current period of the Christian dispensation, and Israel's occupation of Canaan corresponds to the entrance of the risen and glorified Church into its millennial rest. Would it, in the one case, be reasonable to expect that prophecy, instead of ever pointing to and dwelling on the rest of Canaan, should occupy itself chiefly with foretelling the events that were to befall in the wilderness? If the expectation *be* reasonable, it is certain, nevertheless, that it will be disappointed. The predictions relating to the wilderness journey are rapid, cursory, and allusive, while those which direct hope to the land flowing with milk and honey are of an absorbing and final character. Is it then reasonable, in the other case,—we mean the case of the antitype,—to expect that prophecy, comparatively overlooking the full maturity of this dispensation, and the great object of the Church's hope, should fill up with its revelations this interval of unripe and imperfect experience between the Church's exodus, so to speak, and its entrance into Canaan? Was it right that prophecy should descend from Pisgah, and, veiling the eternal glories that were brightening afar along the edge of the wilderness, shed its strongest light on the fading scenes of the wilderness pilgrimage, on its transitory sufferings, and its imperfect joys? Those who expect to find Old Testament Scripture full of present times, and who endeavour to extort from its reluctant prophecies a deliverance consonant to their views, cannot but be labouring under the erroneous idea that this Gospel age belongs to a dispensation different from that which is to proceed after the Lord's appearing. The idea referred to is, though not so palpably, yet not less, erroneous, than it would be to regard the passage of the Israelites through the wilderness as belonging to a different dispensation from that under which they lived after setting foot on the soil of Canaan.

The dispensation of the fulness of times is proceeding. As yet it is only in its first stage,—it yet appears under an imperfect form,—its full development belongs to the future. Great events, vast changes are impending. Their effect will be to remove, as it were, the *debris* of the Adamic dispensation that still continues to deform the earth; and to consolidate, as well as perfectly evolve, the dispensation that is in

Digitized by Google

progress. We shall conclude by just indicating the successive steps, or stages, by which the latter dispensation is advancing to perfection.

It began with the sufferings of Christ, His resurrection and ascension to glory; in other words, it began with the formation of the second Adam, and His appointment or designation to universal empire. During the present stage of its progress, and while the nations are still showing an attitude of rebellion, the elect Church, which is to occupy towards Christ a relation analogous to that which subsisted between Eve and the first Adam, is being called out of the world, and, under the creative hand of the Spirit, prepared for its lofty destiny. All the members of that elect Church are partakers of Christ's sufferings now, as they are to be all sharers in His glory hereafter. It will be said of them all, when they are seen with palms of victory in their hands, standing before the throne of God: "These are they that came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." The pre-adventual tribulation purifies them all; and at the first dawning of the millennium they will be gathered, by the alarm of "the silver trumpet," round the person of their Lord. "In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," the sleeping saints awake, and the waking saints are changed. As the Lamb's wife, "clothed in fine linen, white and clean," they enter their many mansions in the Father's house. The first stage of the dispensation is thus occupied with the formation of the second Adam and of the second Eve: it is signalized not only by the sufferings and the resurrection of Christ, but also by the sufferings and the resurrection of His elect Church. It belongs to *the sixth day* of new creation.

The Lord, now manifested in glory with His Church, executes judgment on the *living* nations, sending down, *body as well as soul*, to everlasting punishment, all among them who have heard the Gospel and disobeyed it (Matt. xxv. 41—46); while, of the *living* nations, both Jews and Gentiles, who have *not* heard the Gospel, He spares a remnant, according to the election of grace. The second stage of the dispensation now begins. The glorified Church enjoys its Sabbath, and, seated on the throne of Christ, reigns with Him over creation. From amidst the flames of its fiery baptism the earth has emerged in fresh and sparkling beauty, as on the day when first it felt the creative touch of God's

Digitized by Google

hand. Over the breadth of it the spared remnant of the nations, Jews and Gentiles, spread themselves, within limits divinely fixed: under the government of Christ and His reigning Church, they enjoy in rich abundance the benefits of redemption: they are all but universally renewed in nature by the Spirit of life, and sprinkled with the blood of atonement: the earth yields her increase, and the evils, which the old world groaned under, are known no more, or only in a comparatively slight degree.

But there is still another stage of the dispensation. As yet the wicked, who were in their graves at the time of the Lord's appearing, have not been raised to judgment, and amidst the population of the millennial earth there obtains even from the first, though general, not universal holiness. As the millennial age advances, many are born, especially in the regions most remote from the Holy City ("*ἐν ταις γωνιαις της γης*," Rev. xx.), who are not converted, and the homage which they offer to the Lord is the homage of lying lips. Ere the chaff be thoroughly separated from the wheat, there must be yet another winnowing time. At the close of the thousand years, Satan, the great sifter, is therefore loosed from his confinement in the bottomless pit, and, by means of a searching or canvassing process, which he is permitted, for that very purpose, to employ, the multitude of hypocrites are separated from the genuine servants of the Lord. They have time enough afterwards allowed them merely to make their disaffection and enmity manifest: then straightway they are consumed with fire from heaven. In a moment they disappear, they perish, and no longer is an unconverted soul to be found on the earth. The resurrection of the wicked follows: they are judged, and cast into the lake of fire. Now, at length the earth is purged from every spot of defilement, and freed from every vestige of the curse. The saints, who have been converted during the millennium, are perfect in holiness, and, subject to the everlasting reign of Christ and His elect Church, they enjoy supreme felicity. The dispensation of the fulness of times is thus completely unfolded, and glory, by means of it, redounds "to the eternal King, the immortal, invisible, and only God," throughout all ages, world without end.

Digitized by Google

Notes on Scripture.

Judges iv. and v.

In these two chapters, the fourth and fifth of Judges, we have an account of the victory of Israel over their enemies; and Deborah's song of triumph, wherein it is celebrated. Perhaps we feel inclined to ask, Why is the Word of God taken up with such details? We have the answer in chap. v. 31, which gives us the moral of the whole subject. "*So* let *all* thine enemies perish, O Lord!" It makes the victory of Israel over Jabin and his host, the earnest of their victories over all their enemies in the latter day, when their King shall come to reign in righteousness, and execute judgment and justice on the earth. Then shall all their enemies perish, but they that love the Lord shall be "as the sun when he goeth forth in his might."

There are, indeed, other instructive lessons, which lie, as it were, on the surface of this record, and which are very profitable to the child of God. For instance, we see that disobedience to God brings misery with it. Israel rebelled against God, and they were delivered into the hands of their enemies; He allowed their enemies to have dominion over them. When they forsook God, then He forsook them.

We learn, further, the tenderness and lovingkindness of God; for when Israel repented, then he heard them, and raised up judges to deliver them.

Moreover, we perceive that the instruments God is wont to use in effecting his ends are of the humblest kind. Shamgar, who delivered Israel, smote with an ox-goad six hundred men; and their great enemy, Sisera, was slain by the hand of a woman; yea, it was a woman that marshalled the expedition. Thus God ever chooses the "weak things of the world to confound the mighty."

These lessons, however, come in only by the way; for the grand drift of this inspired record is to demonstrate, by type, the final victories of Israel, with the Lord Jesus at their head, over all their enemies. Now between the type and the antitype there must be a resemblance. If, accordingly, we compare the circumstances of the conflict here before us, with what the Word of God unfolds to us touching the coming conquests of Christ, as the Redeemer of Israel, we shall find a remarkable similarity between the two.

First, we find from the beginning of the fourth chapter that the children of Israel were *oppressed* at this time: "And the children of Israel cried unto the Lord; for he (Jabin) had nine hundred chariots of iron; and twenty years he mightily oppressed the children of Israel." Here is a rehearsal of a severe oppression of the children of Israel. And what is their present state but a state of oppression? Are they not oppressed still, more or less, by the nations? It is true they now seem to suffer less than formerly. But it is only a lull amid the

Digitized by Google

storm; and if we turn to the prophetic word, we find a time of tribulation reserved for them, so great, that all their former sufferings will prove but faint shadows of it. Thus we read, in Hosea xiii. 6—8, where their sin is described, and their chastisement threatened: "They were filled, and their heart was exalted; therefore have they forgotten me. Therefore I will be unto them as a lion; as a leopard by the way will I observe them; I will meet them as a bear that is bereaved of her whelps, and will rend the caul of their heart, and there will I devour them like a lion: the wild beast shall tear them." Thus God speaks of being to Israel like a lion, like a leopard, like a bear, and like a wild beast. Now, in the seventh chapter of Daniel we read that Daniel saw a vision which greatly troubled him: "Four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another. The first was "like *a lion*." . . . "And behold another beast, a second, like to *a bear*." . . . "After this, I beheld, and lo, another, like *a leopard*." . . . "After this I saw in the night visions, and behold, a fourth *beast*, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly," &c. Daniel is specially troubled about this fourth beast; and, inquiring as to the import of the vision, is told by God: "The ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise; and another shall rise after them." . . . "And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time, and times, and the dividing of time." This fourth beast is, obviously, the Antichrist of the last days; of whom Jabin, and Pharaoh, and all who have oppressed the children of Israel, were but types. His end is described in the ninth and following verses of this seventh chapter of Daniel: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow." . . . "Ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened. I beheld, then, because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld, even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame." Then follows the description of the great Redeemer whose kingdom is to succeed: "I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days." . . . "And there was given *him* dominion and glory, and a kingdom." This shows us that as Israel was oppressed in former times, so they will be in the latter times, especially just before their promised blessedness, under Messiah.

But to proceed. In the nineteenth verse of this fifth chapter of Judges, we read: "The kings came and fought, then fought the kings of Canaan in Taanach by the waters of Megiddo; they took no gain of money." Here we have an epitome of the whole scene, the counterpart of which will be transacted, by and by, on a large scale. Observe, then, secondly, there was at this period *a combination against Israel: the kings came and fought*; and in the sixteenth chapter of the Revelation, we read: "And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the

Digitized by Google

great river Euphrates." . . . "And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of devils working miracles, which go forth unto *the kings of the earth*, and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty. And he gathered them together into a place called, in the Hebrew tongue, Armageddon." Thus we have here also a combination of kings. And *the place* where they muster is the same, in both cases—Armageddon, or Megiddo.

Again, returning to the nineteenth verse, "*they took no gain of money.*" This phrase is rather peculiar; but we may learn from it that there were *no mercenary motives actuating these kings.* The one common purpose which animated them was the subjecting of Israel. Now, in the seventeenth of Revelation, ver. 12, 13, we find: "And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet; but receive power as kings one hour with the beast. *These have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the beast.*" This beast, it need scarcely be said, is the Antichrist again; and it is observable that neither are *his* confederate kings mercenaries. On the contrary, they are equally interested with himself in the combat: they "have all one mind." This feature, in the comparison, is enlarged on in the eighty-third Psalm, verses 1—5: "Keep not thou silence, O God: hold not thy peace, and be not still, O God. For, lo, thine enemies make a tumult: and they that hate thee have lifted up the head. They have taken crafty counsel against thy people, and consulted against thy hidden ones. They have said, Come, and let us cut them off from being a nation; that the name of Israel may be no more in remembrance. For they have consulted together *with one consent*, (or, one heart,) they are confederate against thee."

The next verses contain the *enumeration* of the confederate nations. And it is remarkable, as, in Revelation, we are told that there are to be ten kings; so, in this Psalm, we find that very number of nations mentioned; and, doubtless, these are the very nations who will figure on the stage, in the latter days of Jacob's trouble. They may have modern names, but the localities are the same. Nor need we be surprised at this turning out to be the case; for, in the East, marvellous things are even now occurring, indicative of the revival of the ancient seats of empire.

But the Psalm goes on: "Do unto them as unto the Midianites; as to Sisera, as to Jabin, at the brook of Kison: which perished at En-dor: they became as dung for the earth." Thus, the very victory in Judges is pleaded as the precedent for the future; the language used being inspired beforehand, for the occasion, by the Holy Ghost.

Once more, referring to the ninth verse of the chapter before us, we read: "My heart is toward the governors of Israel, that offered themselves *willingly* among the people." And in the 110th Psalm, the 3rd verse, we find the antitype to this: "Thy people shall *be willing* in the day of thy power." If we examine the context, we shall find it is the Lord Jesus Christ who is addressed, as the leader

Digitized by Google

of the armies against Antichrist. In the previous verses, He is contemplated as at the Father's right hand, but, at length, coming forth to triumph over his enemies; in which character it is natural he should be followed by a host. But who will this host be? The tribes of Israel. Accordingly, just like the governors of Israel, who "offered themselves willingly" when the kings came and fought by the waters of Megiddo; so, at the future, when the Lord shall send the rod of Christ's strength out of Zion, and the time will come for it to be said, "Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies," *then*, His people shall be willing,—namely, in the day of his power,—willing to follow Him, to enlist under his banner; perhaps, his sign seen in the heavens. I conceive that this is what the willingness, here celebrated, relates to; and it is interesting to find that the Chaldee rendering of the whole passage confirms this view. It runs thus: "Thy people shall be willing *in the day that thou shalt wage war.*"

Lastly, to complete the analogy, in the typical history there were *supernatural allies* with Israel. "The stars in their courses fought against Sisera." And so, at the latter day, the "armies in heaven" will, with the Lord Jesus Christ as their leader, come to the destruction of the enemies of Israel.

This song of triumph, then, is a prophecy, a prophetic history of the future; and it leads to a prayer, in the mouth of Deborah, that all God's enemies may perish in like manner. The enemies of Israel, in this case, perished ignominiously and shamefully, Sisera, their leader, being killed by the hand of a woman. And "*so*," cries the prophetess, "let *all* thine enemies perish, O Lord!"

In the next clause, the imagery used to denote the prosperity of those who love the Lord, is their shining forth as the sun; and it is the same that we find employed in the parable of the tares:* "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." This language is generally supposed to refer to the Church, the saints of God, in this dispensation; but, perhaps, we ought to question this interpretation, when we find it previously employed, as we see in Deborah's song, to describe the portion of the faithful in Israel. Should it not suggest to us, that the interpretation of the parable of the tares, in the thirteenth of Matthew, rather refers, in strictness, to the Jewish people in the latter day, from amongst whom shall be gathered out the apostate faction of Antichrist; when, as the prophet says, "Every one that is left in Zion shall be holy." (Isa. iv. 3.) If we examine the parable more closely we shall see that this interpretation is the only consistent one. For example, who are the good seed? Our Lord explains: "The children of the kingdom." But this is the denomination given by him elsewhere to the Jewish people. Should we not consider, then, that when he uses it in the parable of the tares, he would have us attach the same meaning to it? Then, again, as to the tares,—"the children of the

* To this interpretation of the parable of the tares we demur; also to the exclusively Jewish aspect in which several texts are viewed in this paper.—EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

wicked one,"—they are dealt with prior to the former, "the children of the kingdom." But if the latter denote the Church, the reverse should be the case, for the wicked are not to be judged till after the translation of the Church. Therefore, it is manifest, on the whole, that this parable, and probably with it the entire series in the thirteenth of Matthew, has a Jewish application, and, like this historical type in Judges, points to the *setting up of the kingdom amongst the Jews, in the latter day.* And so, the Lord's words, "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father," are but the setting of his seal to Deborah's prayer, and may receive from us a uniform interpretation.

But, returning to the point just noticed, that this is a prophetic prayer, this consideration teaches us *the period* to which its legitimate use belongs,—namely, when the Lord rises up to judgment on his enemies. Then, under the recurrence of circumstances analogous to those in which Deborah poured forth her inspirations, will it be a righteous thing for the Jewish remnant to evoke the avenging interposition of Messiah on the ranks of the Antichristian host. But now is the time of grace,—another dispensation altogether,—in which the Lord is *softening* his enemies, and *making friends of them,* not *taking vengeance* upon them. The characteristic of God's dealing now is *forbearance ;* therefore, this prayer is not for the saints of this dispensation. Like their Lord, *grace* is what they are called to exhibit. But they are waiting for the coming of their Lord ; and then, when it will be right for Him to take vengeance on his enemies, it will be right for them to sympathize, yea, to co-operate, for this is one feature of their future occupation. And this qualifying remark, I hold, applies to all those imprecatory petitions in the Psalms, that stumble many of the children of God. They are intended for the time when, the saints being translated, the Lord's strange work of judgment shall be theirs, and, a persecuted Jewish remnant being in the land, it will dispensationally belong to them to cry aloud for retribution.

This suggests a concluding reflection as to the present position of the children of God. They are taken into communion with God, and know his mind ; in a word, they are *saved ;* and their salvation is not merely deliverance from the wrath of God, but also fellowship with God himself. How ought we to walk with God, then, as friends and adult children, in conformity with this blessed privilege of acquaintance with all His plans and purposes as revealed in His Word ! And the more we know of that precious word, especially the word of prophecy, the more *material* we have for *sanctification.* We earnestly study a letter from a friend ; we love to know, not merely what he has done, but what he *purposes doing.* Let us, then, treat the Word of God in the same manner ; and let his purposes be as diligently contemplated by us as what he *has* done, and *is now* doing. If we are children of God, and realize our position as such, we shall value every portion of his blessed word, no matter how difficult it is. Let us thus draw near to God, enjoy his confidence, and not keep at a distance from

Digitized by Google

him, indifferent to his counsels. And it is specially needful, in these times, for the child of God to be acquainted with the *crises* which are coming, that he may not be deceived by the delusions of Satan and the spirit of the age.

Surely, too, in the prospect of these things, a voice of warning is needful for the unconverted. What a snare is preparing for them in the advent of that Antichrist of whom we have already seen some intimations from Scripture: "Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish!" (2 Thess. ii. 9, 10.) And why will they perish? "Because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And *for this cause* God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie." God forbid, reader, that this should be your portion! But remember, that estrangement from God is the inclined plane to it. The only way to escape such a terrible consummation is by submission to the cross of Jesus. And then you shall be found *waiting* for this glorious hope, the appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ. K.

A PRACTICAL WORD FOR THE TIMES.

PSALM lxviii. 35: "O God, thou art terrible out of thy holy places."

THERE is a proneness in some minds to magnify the importance of passing events, and to think the days in which *they* live the most astonishing that ever were. This was done by those who lived in the generations gone by; they overrated the events of their times, and considered that prophecies were then fulfilling, which students of the present age, with good reason, regard as yet future. We do not enough look at things relatively; we do not apprehend the vastness of the events which crowd around the time of the end. We are prone to mistake the agitation of preparation, for the actual conflict—the signs of the times, for the events of the last days. The mistakes of others, and the tendencies of our own minds should produce caution, and lead us to be very sober in our conclusions.

Still it must be allowed that in many respects the character of our times is unparalleled, and that the events which have recently taken place, and which are still transpiring around us, are truly astonishing, both as regards magnitude and number. *We* behold changes which most probably are the harbingers of still greater changes; and revolutions which seem likely to give birth to other revolutions. The state of things three months after the recent outbreak in France was thus described in one of the periodicals of the day, and this description is still but too true: "The state of the European continent may be described as completely by one word as by ten thousand. All that we can learn at least may be expressed fully by a single word: that word is—*chaos*. In the north, in the south, in the east, in the west, everywhere—CHAOS."

Digitized by Google

Is it so that God has permitted society in so many places, and over such a wide field, to run into a chaotic state? Who then can help feeling amazed? Who can but exclaim with the prophet, "What shall be the end of these wonders?" The numbers implicated—the interests involved—the woes inflicted—the retribution hurled down—the depravity manifested—the uncertainty of the results—all excite intense solicitude, and constrain millions to look on with astonishment and wonder.

Some lookers-on wonder with *exultation*. The desire of their eyes is before them. They have longed and wished to see social order subverted—to see the political fabric which, till lately, stood in imposing grandeur, thrown down. They scarcely expected to see their desires realized, but behold they are exceeded! Kings are become wanderers, and nobles reduced to poverty. "Liberty, equality, and fraternity," are the watchwords of the nations, and soon the revilers of dignities hope to see all upon a level, and to enrich themselves in the general scramble.

Some wonder *hopefully*. These do not adopt the levelling principles of the former class, nor sympathize with them in their frantic hatred of all institutions a little older than themselves, and all persons a little greater than themselves; but considering how many abuses existed in the fallen dynasties—how much corruption prevailed in society—how conscience was fettered—the Bible interdicted, and liberty crushed, they think that a retributive Providence is to be traced in all that has taken place, and are full of hope that out of these changes a better state of things will soon spring. They look at the chaos, and expect to see a new political creation arise, in which liberty, order, and plenty will prevail.

Others wonder and *fear*. They cannot forget the past. They see the historic page red with blood whenever it records a popular revolution. They believe that real liberty is of slow growth, and that it cannot be forced into existence by human passions. They fear a reaction on the side of tyranny and military despotism. They have learned that the veriest tyrant that ever polluted a throne, is not so much to be dreaded as a maddened populace. On these grounds they fear, and when they consider the moral condition of the nations among whom these scenes are enacting—their ignorance, superstition, and infidelity—their impatience of all restraint—their selfishness, vanity, and pride, with the profanity and sensuality everywhere abounding, they feel that they have good reason to fear rather than to hope, and this conviction is deepened when they turn to that book which tells them of "perilous times," of Armageddon's fearful scene, of "a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation."

But let us bear in mind that we have something else to do beside *wondering*. However wrong the motives which have actuated the authors of those changes—however much good may be trampled down by these rude assaults on various institutions, one thing is certain, and in this we can but rejoice, a way is opened for the spread of the Gospel. The word of God is no longer bound. The ministers of the

Digitized by Google

Gospel are not now in danger of imprisonment, nor can kings punish people for thinking differently from themselves. Let this season be diligently improved. Let those who love the truth, seek by every means in their power to circulate it. Let them try to get the leaven of Gospel doctrine into the mass of European ignorance and superstition. Circulate the Bible. Assist those who preach the truth, and who could preach it more extensively if they were furnished with the means. The command of Jesus to act thus is most imperative at all times, and binding on all Christians, and his love should ever constrain to diligence in this delightful work; but at the present moment the signs of the times furnish special and powerful arguments not to hold our peace, but to endeavour to preach the glad tidings to every creature. The opportunity of doing this may not last long. War may break out, or governments professedly founded on liberal principles may enact rigorous laws against God's truth; or the clouds of judgment, which appear to overhang our world, may pour down their burning contents, and no more witnessing *then*. Let us therefore enter while the door is open, and proclaim to the tumultuous nations of Europe true freedom through the Son of God.

Nor let us forget our duty to those around us. Although our beloved country has been spared hitherto, and the shocks of the political earthquake have been but slightly felt in our favoured land, yet even we have heard some strange rumbling noises beneath our feet; and dismal sounds have moaned in our ears, which, being interpreted, say, "Be not highminded, but fear." Let us all try to spread truth around us, and to lead poor sinners to Jesus. Let not professing Christians go on hoarding up much, and giving little. Surely this is not a time to add house to house, and field to field, when the Lord's chariot of judgment is on its way. Alas! how will many professors answer for their niggard giving, when called to give an account of their stewardship?

We should also *watch* as well as wonder. *Watch the workings of our great enemy.* He ever seeks to mould society to his own mind. The great author of the systems of Paganism and Popery is still in existence, and still busily employed. When, some 1200 years ago, European society was reduced almost to a chaos by the incursions of barbarous nations upon an empire debased by luxury, and a Church robbed of its strength and beauty, Satan brooded over that chaos, and brought forth POPERY. He will again extend his awful wings over the chaos around us, and it may be that the last form of evil, the grand personificator of human wickedness, will be educed. There may be for a time in some places and in some things, an *appearance* of good; under which some fearful evil is being nourished. Let us not be deceived by appearances. *Where God is not, there Satan is.* He may work for a time in secret, he may take the garb of an angel of light, but his deeds are darkness, and their end is death.

Let us watch our own hearts. Whatever is the prevailing spirit of the times, the people of God are in danger from the same. We are all now breathing an atmosphere impregnated with political excite-

Digitized by Google

ment. If we live much in it, we shall become worldly in spirit, and carnal in aim. Let us retire to the closet, and seek to breathe in the element of communion with God. Woe to the professor who lives and moves, and has his being in this world's politics, and does not keep up converse with God. It will be well for him if the poet's words are not verified in him—

> "Their breath is agitation, and their life,
> A storm whereon they ride to sink at last."

Daniel and Joseph were politicians, so was Wilberforce; but they were all men of prayer, living near to God, and they served their own generation to some purpose. The spirit of the times is intensely political,—let the Christian beware.

Watch for the coming of the Lord. This is "*our blessed hope.*" All will remain wrong and imperfect until he return again. We know not when the time is, but we have reason to believe that it draweth near. There may be many events first, or few, or none. "He cometh at an hour when men think not." If he delays awhile we will not be discouraged, but endeavour to "occupy till he come." If he should come suddenly, we shall not (if found clinging to his cross) be dismayed. He will come for his saints' blessedness, Israel's restoration, and earth's regeneration. He will sit upon his throne and say, "Behold I make all things new." Out of a worse social chaos than that which we now behold, He will educe beauty and order, and men shall be blessed in Him, and all nations shall call Him blessed.

Isaiah xxiv. 6.

"Therefore the inhabitants of the earth are burned, and few men left."

This is one of the many passages which point to the fiery deluge of the latter day. It speaks of it as the judgment upon the world for its iniquity. The fire has been long restrained; the long-suffering of God has prevented its being kindled, that men might repent; but at length the world's cup is filled up, and God can forbear no longer. He lets loose the consuming flame to destroy the guilty inhabitants of the earth. Yet they are not all destroyed. Some are preserved. A few are left.

Thus the prophet teaches us that from the great conflagration, *some* are to escape. They may be but few, but they shall be enough to repeople the earth. And whatever may be the difficulty of understanding how this preservation can be accomplished, still the above passage reveals the fact. And no difficulty of ours as to the *manner* of the preservation, should hinder our belief of an event thus plainly made known.

Digitized by Google

Philippians iii. 12—14.

Here is the beginning and the ending of a saint's career. It begins by being "apprehended of Christ Jesus," and it ends by "apprehending" the prize. The interval is the life of faith, and conflict, and pressing onward. Not a life of doubting and uncertainty as to personal acceptance, for so some would pervert the words, "I count not myself to have apprehended," but a life of eager hastening forwards to a reward still future. That reward was the glory of the first resurrection; as the apostle speaks in a previous verse, "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead."

The order, then, is this. Christ lays his hands on us, and apprehends us when dead in sin. We believe, and in believing are justified, accepted, made heirs of God. Then the race and the combat begin. It is carried on with the prize in view. On that prize our eye is fixed, and we press forward to it, never resting till it be reached, till resurrection-glory be ours, when Jesus returns.

Revelation iii. 28.

"I will give him the morning star."

Christ himself is the morning star. He is to arise upon this dark world like "the light of the morning." (2 Sam. xxiii. 4.) In one sense he has always been the light of the world; but the light has shone in the darkness, and the darkness has not received it. But at his return he shall cause his light to burst forth in power, sweeping all darkness before it, and filling the world with its radiance.

It is to the peculiar glory and splendour of that promised morning that he here refers. "I will give him the morning star." I will, in a peculiar manner, reveal myself to him then as the morning star. I will give him all the blessings which I, as morning star, will bring with me when I arise. On him shall be shed down the calm and blessed light of the resurrection morning, awaking him from his long sleep, and bidding him arise at the dawning of the day.

Thrice-blessed promise to us, living as we do amid the darkness of a dark world, and feeling that darkness thicken around us as the last days are hastening on. Let us be of good cheer, for the night is far spent, and the day is at hand.

Digitized by Google

Reviews.

Lateinos is the Mark or the Name of the Beast, and is, therefore, the Solution of St. John's Enigma. By the Rev. REGINALD RABETT, M.A. London: W. S. Painter. 1849.

THE author of this work (the title of which we have taken the liberty of abbreviating) has, we think, proved his point; but he might have done so with equal effect in a tenth part of the space had he avoided the repetitions with which the volume abounds, *usque ad nauseam.* His language, also, is far too dogmatic for our taste, and in speaking of the pre-millennial advent, a doctrine for which he seems to have a special abhorrence, it degenerates into absolute raving.

Without noticing his theory of the beast and its seven heads, with which we cannot agree, we shall state shortly the points which we think he has established.

1. The name of the beast must be the name of a man.

2. It must be a name, the letters of which in the *Greek* language form the number given in the text.

3. This number must be 666, and not 616, as some have proposed to read.

These three propositions dispose of every other conjecture that has yet been proposed, except LATEINOS,—a solution which was first suggested by Irenæus. But our author has some special objections to make against those solutions, which, next to Lateinos, have the greatest weight of authority. He complains, and with justice, that Mr. Elliott, after selecting this name Lateinos, should have again thrown the question into uncertainty by proposing the alternative solution of ἡ λατεινη βασιλεια, which is not the name of a man at all. Mr. Faber's theory, that αποϛατης is the name intended, is easily disposed of, by the consideration that the word, if spelt as above, has no numeral value at all; for the abbreviation ϛ, which stands for στ, is quite different from the *episemon* which stands for the numeral *six*, and, in fact, was not brought into use till the middle of the thirteenth century: whereas αποστατης, spelt at length, has the value not of 666, but of 1160. Mr. Rabett has also brought forward conclusive evidence that Lateinus was spelt with the diphthong by the old Roman authors, and that all analogy favours a corresponding diphthongal spelling when the name is translated into Greek.

The Red Republic; or, the Scarlet-coloured Beast of the Apocalypse. By the Rev. ALEXANDER HISLOP. Edinburgh: William Whyte and Co. 1849.

THE title of this unpretending little work might lead those who have not perused it to class it among the rash attempts, so rife just now, to

Digitized by Google

apply prophecy to the events of the day. There could not be a greater mistake. The author has evidently thought much, and he reasons soundly upon his subject, which is the prophesying and death of the two witnesses. On some points we are constrained to differ with him. Surely he is wrong in identifying (as he does, page 18,) the "holy city" with the "great city Babylon," in which the witnesses are slain. On the main point, however, of his exposition he holds his ground successfully against Elliott, and the author of the "Seventh Vial," proving, we think, to demonstration, that the "beast from the sea" and the "beast from the abyss" are not one and the same. It may be true, as his opponents contend, that "the sea" and "the abyss" are interchangeable expressions in classical authorship; but it is just as true that they are *not* interchangeable in apocalyptic imagery. The locusts come out of the abyss;—do they rise from the sea? Satan is shut up in the abyss;—is he shut up in the sea? Clearly the abyss of the Apocalypse is a place of fire and smoke, opening upon the earth by a mouth which admits of being closed and sealed. If, then, the Dragon is the Roman Empire in its Paganism, and the Beast of the sea is the Roman Empire in its Papal form, the Beast from the abyss must be the same empire in some yet undeveloped character. At present the Beast *was* and *is not.* Do we not see at this moment in Germany the attempt to resuscitate it? It received its deadly wound from Napoleon, but that wound seems on the point of being healed, and then all the world shall wonder after the Beast. The Pope, too, has ceased to be a horn of the Beast;—his secular power is gone: but the Papacy, by this very event, has become assimilated to the last symbol by which it is designated in the Apocalypse. Stripped of all but its spiritual authority, it appears as the *harlot* ready to mount the Beast, and to direct its energies to the slaying of the witnesses.

A Guide to the Epistles of Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ, &c. By the Rev. Alexander Dallas, M.A. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1849.

There is much here that may be helpful to the reader of the Epistles, both in a practical and an expository way. Mr. Dallas's fervent spirit, devotedness in the ministry of the Gospel, and watchfulness for the Lord's coming, breathe throughout its pages.

An Introduction to the Book of Job. London: J. B. Bateman. 1849.

A little work containing many excellent suggestions towards the understanding of that book.

Digitized by Google

The Number of the Beast ; or, the Duration of the Papal Kingdom : an Historical Sketch, with a new Explication of the Triple Crown as the Symbol of the Number 666. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1849.

A VERY good *historical* sketch, but doubtful in its prophetical bearings.

Introduction and Notes to a Chart of the Sacred History of the World. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1849.

A Chart of the Sacred History of the World. Ditto. Ditto.

THIS Chart is full and elaborate, evidently compiled with care, and the result of much research. Along with the "Introduction," it forms a very valuable compendium of history, from the Creation to the Birth of Christ.

Past Fulfilment of Prophecy a Guide to Future. Bath: Binns and Goodwin. 1849.

IN applying the term *futurist* to this work, we mean nothing reproachful or offensive,—simply *distinctive.* We have never used the expression as a *bye-word :* and though unable to receive the futurist *system,* we are willing to weigh the futurist *arguments.* We hope, ere long, to take up the subject at length, which, in a brief notice like the present, we cannot do. Meanwhile, we may say, that the present work contains a clear and compact sketch of futurism, or rather, we should say, of extreme futurism.

Notes on the Prophecies of the Apocalypse. By H. F. BURDER, D.D. London: Ward and Co. 1849.

THESE Notes are brief, and, to us, not very satisfactory, though occasionally suggesting something useful. We bear no grudge against the author for speaking of Millennarianism as a "delusive hypothesis," page 6; and though we have read his arguments at page 233 and onwards, we remain most thoroughly unconvinced. It is curious to notice, that Dr. Burder has been compelled from the force of exegesis, like Professor Stuart, to interpret the first resurrection *literally.* He remarks: "I can perceive no substantial or sufficient reason against the literal sense and natural meaning of the expressions employed." (Page 228.) We accept the testimony to the literality of the passage, so far as it goes, and ask our anti-millennarian friends to ponder it, and to suspend their wonder at *us* for venturing to expound it literally. The words of Scripture are beginning to be felt to be too strong, too simple, too explicit for spiritualization. It is well that some ground is gained.

Digitized by Google

The Apocalypse Interpreted in the Light of the Day of the Lord. By the Rev. JAMES KELLY, M.A. Vol. I. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1849.

THE leading idea of Mr. Kelly's exposition is, that all the events predicted in the Apocalypse are to take place *in the day of the Lord;* that is, *after* the Lord has come and caught up his saints. The day of the Lord, he says, "means a time distinct from, and *posterior to,* the coming of the Lord, for the saints of this dispensation." (Page 36.) It is not till after this great day has set in that the seven Churches of Asia arise, and it is not till after it that any one event in the Apocalypse begins to be fulfilled. Such is the great feature of Mr. Kelly's book. And it is here, we think, that its first error is to be found. For,

1. That the fulfilment of the entire Apocalypse is reserved till after Christ has come appears to us wholly *unproved.* Mr. Kelly's proof has quite failed to convince us. It rests entirely on the meaning of the words, κυριακη ἡμερα:

2. In all the promises to the seven Churches, the Lord's coming is spoken of as *future,* not as past,—an event to be watched for as still impending. How can this be if the Lord has already come? Mr. Kelly's answer is, that Christ has, no doubt, already come and caught up the saints of the present dispensation, but that he is to come in another way to the saints that exist *after this* and before the Millennium. We are quite at a loss here. We find no Scripture proof of one Coming to one class of saints, and of another Coming to another class of saints. And if Mr. Kelly's apocalyptic views be correct, then not one of the promises of Christ's coming given in the Revelation are applicable to *us* at all. They all refer to that class who are to be upon the earth after the Lord has come to "the saints of this dispensation."

3. As Mr. Kelly himself remarks, "all the promises addressed to the Churches (*i.e.*, the Churches of Asia,) run up to the time of the Lord's coming, *contemporaneous with resurrection,* when the mere happiness of the intermediate state is crowned with glory." (Page 86.) But according to Mr. Kelly's system, the resurrection must have taken place *before* these Churches were in existence; for the living saints are changed, and the dead saints raised at the Lord's coming, and before "the day of the Lord." How, then, can the promises to these Churches point to resurrection if the first resurrection is passed already? There cannot, surely, be *two* first resurrections,—one resurrection for one class of saints, and another resurrection, a few years after, for another class.

4. The scenes in the concluding verses of the twentieth chapter occur not only after the "day of the Lord" has passed, but after the whole millennial period has passed. How, then, can it be said that all the apocalyptic scenes are laid in the day of the Lord, and that John, by being transported (in spirit) into that day, saw them all passing before his eye?

Digitized by Google

5. When the Lord said (Rev. xxii. 20), "Surely I come quickly," did he not mean this promise to apply to that class of saints of which John was the representative,—that class that are to be caught up when he comes? Does not John's "Amen" imply this? How, then, can it be proved that the other promises of his coming in this book apply to a different class of saints, viz., those that are to exist after the first class has been caught up?

6. We should be inclined to believe that the promises made to the seven Churches, and the promises regarding the New Jerusalem (which are identical with the former), were made to all the saints,—to the whole body of Christ. But if the present theory be true, these glorious promises regarding the "crown of life," the "hidden manna," the "morning star," "power over the nations," the "white raiment," the "new name," the sitting on Christ's throne, &c., are only given to those who are to exist *after* "the saints of this dispensation" have been caught up. In these promises *we* have no share;—they are for the "seven Jewish gatherings." It is for *them* that the tree of life grows, for *them* that the morning star shines, for *them* that the crown of life is prepared, for *them* that the throne of Christ is erected, for *them* that the New Jerusalem comes down.

We have not room to advert to many of the details of interpretation given in this volume. We dissent from so many of them that an examination of them all would be impossible.

But let us rather give our readers some specimens of what we consider really excellent and valuable in Mr. Kelly's work. Many of the practical remarks are admirable. Some of the hints on passages of Scripture are worthy of attention:—

"Oh! then, acquaint thyself, reader, with your God. And if you inquire how you can compass this, remember, it can only be by the Holy Ghost opening your eyes to see him as revealed in Christ. And be further assured, it is necessary to know God, and thus have peace with him, in order to relish this precious book. They who are not at peace with God, as pardoned sinners, will naturally disparage it, for they are taken up with themselves, and care not for his glorious purposes, of which this book is full." Page 13.

"*The beginning and the ending.*—This is not to be confounded with the import of 'Alpha and Omega.' This latter signifies that all knowledge is centered in Christ. But 'the beginning and the ending' refer to all time and space; that is, all varieties, diversities, and changes which have, or will, run their course, find their boundaries in the secret of his glorious person, set up from everlasting, and to be brought forth in glory at his second advent." Page 24.

"But now, let us not forget what was necessary before John could receive the communications before us; he had to be taken out of himself, so to speak—to be '*in the Spirit.*' Can *we*, then, enter aright on a study of the subject, and not be in special communion with God? And let this thought affect the unconverted reader. If you would profit by these truths, you must, in the first place, submit to God, and be reconciled to him. Then, taking the place of children at his feet; washed in the blood of Christ, elect kings and priests with Him to God; you will be able to profit, and have your souls refreshed and enlarged by the truths here presented to you; you will, as it were, read the description of the preferment God has entailed on you—your future estate. But, if you enter not thus upon the subject, be assured, it will prove dry and uninteresting to you; unless, indeed, you take it up as you would a romance—

Digitized by Google

and by this means, also, let it be remembered, Satan knows how to ensnare souls. Alas! on every side there is disaster likely to ensue to him who walks not with God, either in his total neglect, or abuse of this book. May we all then realize, and be stedfast in the assurance of, the *grace* which God has given us in Jesus Christ. Then, in this Revelation, shall we enjoy the thrilling description of that *glory* with which God will crown his work."—Page 40.

"Ver. 3. *And for my name's sake hast laboured, and hast not fainted.*—The Head of the Church thus continues his strain of commendation. This shews us that the work of this Angel and his brethren is not a mechanical thing; but the fruit of love to Christ. And here let the child of God be very jealous over himself. For it is very possible to go through a daily routine of religious occupation, and yet be only animated by a sort of galvanic life, generated by the circumstances around us. In which case, the event will naturally be, the settling down into selfish indolence; for all artificial motions must sooner or later come to an end. That which suggests the persuasion of 'better things, and things which accompany salvation,' is, as the apostle writes, the work and labour of *love*, shewed towards *the name of Christ*. (Heb. vi. 10.) Where love is the moving principle of activity, there will be perseverance; and the reason why many have run well for a while, but at last have fallen back to the world, is, that they possessed not this principle of vitality."—Page 70.

The Atlas of Prophecy; being the Prophecies of Daniel and St. John, with a simple Exposition, and a Series of Maps and Charts, exhibiting their Fulfilment in the History of the Church and of the World. London: Seeleys. 1849.

Externally and typographically this is one of the handsomest volumes that we have seen for some time. Its contents display considerable care and study, both in research and arrangement. In general, the author seems to follow Mr. Elliott, and the scheme of prophecy detailed in this *Atlas* will be, in its leading features, familiar to Mr. Elliott's readers. The author's condensed method of presenting the subject is of great advantage to the reader. The charts and maps are most useful in illustrating the author's scheme.

We differ from him on many points—too many to specify. One, however, we may advert to, viz., his interpretation of the twentieth chapter of the Apocalypse. As to the resurrection and reign of the saints, he says nothing. But as to the binding of Satan he remarks: "The binding of the old serpent, the dragon, which symbol had been throughout connected with Rome pagan and papal, may be intended to foreshew some great removal and suppression of the Roman sway, of that influence which, for two thousand years, pagan and papal, has bound the greater part of the civilized world in the chains of superstition." And is this all?—For the use of our readers we add the list of maps and charts:—

1. The Four Empires of Daniel.
2. The Ten Kingdoms in their rise.
3. The Ten Kingdoms in the 1260 years.
4. Empire of Honorius, and its division into Ten Kingdoms.
5. to 8. Four Charts of the Seals.
9. Preparation for the Trumpets.
10. Chart of the Trumpets.
11. Chart of the Reformation. (Rev. xiv.)
12. Chart of the 1260 years.
13. General History of Christendom.
14. Predicted Kingdom of the Messiah.

Digitized by Google

Mornings among the Jesuits at Rome; being Notes of Conversations held with certain Jesuits on the subject of Religion in the City of Rome. By the Rev. M. H. Seymour, M.A. London: Seeleys. 1849.

We need not hesitate to call this one of the most singular books that has seen the light within this age. It is quite *unique.* Who has passed such mornings at Rome? Who has heard such conversations to record? From first to last the interest is intense and unabated. In description it is vivid and powerful; in argument learned and able.

A Practical Guide to the Greek Testament, designed for those who have no knowledge of the Greek language, but who desire to read the New Testament in the original. London: Bagster and Sons. 1849.

This is another of those most valuable helps to the study of the Holy Scriptures, for which the Church is so much indebted to the Messrs. Bagster. Both in Hebrew and Greek criticism, the works published by them are among the most helpful to students of any that this century has seen. Their translation of Gesenius stands unrivalled, and their Analytical Hebrew Lexicon is beyond price to a student of that language. For helping on the study of the Holy Scripture in the original languages, and especially for assisting prophetical studies, we recommend, most cordially, such works as the above.

A Solution of the Enigma in the Prophecy of Obadiah. By the Rev. W. Mackenzie. Johnstone. 1849.

The author of this is evidently an accomplished Hebrew scholar, and thus far his little work has value. But it is framed so entirely upon the allegorical system, that we can agree with little or none of it. It reminds us more of Origen and Jerome than any modern commentary. Yet it is the work of an ingenious mind, and a truly spiritual man.

The Christianity of Abraham; with Patriarchal Prophecy. Seeleys. 1849.

There is some ability, and also some originality, in many parts of this work; so that the reader may glean not a little from it. At the same time there are many doubtful statements, and many questionable expressions.

Towards the commencement there are reiterated statements as to the way of justification, which we cannot but dissent from. The author seems to consider justification as, somehow or other, the *reward* of faith; and yet not of faith alone, but of faith after it has been fully accredited as genuine by a life of obedience. Faith, according to him, justifies *because* it contains all holiness within it in the germ; whereas,

Digitized by Google

according to Scripture, faith justifies because of its connecting us with the Saviour. In justification faith is looked upon simply in its relationship to Christ, not in its relationship to good works. Good works must of necessity follow real faith. But still it is not faith leading to good works that justifies, but faith leading to the Saviour. This distinction the author seems not to have appreciated; yet it is one of unspeakable moment. If it be disregarded, justification by works is at once introduced, and that in the most subtle form.

The Priest upon his Throne; being Lectures delivered during Lent, 1849, *at St. George's, Bloomsbury, by twelve Clergymen of the Church of England, with a Preface by the Rev. J. H. Stewart, M.A.* London: J. Nisbet and Co.

This is the seventh course of Lectures delivered in St. George's, Bloomsbury, in seven successive years, by twelve clergymen of the Church of England. For seven years has this testimony been lifted up before the Churches respecting the coming and kingdom of the Lord. The testimony for the present year is as decided as formerly—as vigorously lifted up, as scriptural, and as practical. The volume is of a high cast and tone, well sustained throughout. It contains many fine expositions of Scripture, and high thoughts about the promised kingdom. It stands fully on a level with any of its six predecessors.

Institutes of Theology. By the late Thomas Chalmers, D.D., LL.D. In two volumes. Vol. I. Edinburgh: Sutherland and Knox. 1849.

It is impossible for us to review this work at length in our pages, or even to give an adequate sketch of its contents. Those who knew Dr. Chalmers, or who have heard him lecture, will recognise him in every page of the volume.

These Institutes of Theology are very valuable; and will, of a certainty, take a high place among kindred works, on account of their clearness and vigour—their power of thought and style—their maturity and fulness—their solidity and soundness. They will form an admirable text-book for Colleges, and an invaluable manual for either students or ministers. Our limits prevent us saying more—but less than this we could not say.

The History of the Cross practically considered; being Lectures in Passion Week, 1849. By the Rev. J. B. Lowe, A.B. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1849.

There is an amount of fresh thought and clear statement in this little work which makes it most acceptable. It is superior, in spirit, in style, and in doctrine.

Digitized by Google

The Chiliast; or, the Millenarian Inquirer. London: Houlston and Stoneman. 1848.

WITHOUT expressing concurrence in all the author's views, we may say that this volume contains a great deal that is truly excellent. There are many interesting expositions of Scripture, and clear statements of Divine truth.

On the Genealogies contained in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. Third Edition. By WILLIAM BEESTON. London: J. Hearne. 1842.

IT is some years since the above was published; but having been sent to us a short time ago, we read it carefully, and we can say with no common interest. The subject is, in some respects, perhaps rather dry; but the clear, accurate, original way in which the author states his views has attracted us. On the subject before him, he casts most important light, as well as on some collateral passages of Scripture.

Sacred Latin Poetry, chiefly lyrical, selected and arranged for use; with Notes and Introduction. By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, M.A. London: Parker. 1849.

THERE are some things in this volume upon which we intended to have remarked—some sentiments in the notes, and some lines in the hymns. But we found this impossible without a fuller review than we could afford room for. At the same time we may say that the selections are in general made with great taste and judgment. Take the following notes of the prophetic lyre in the seventh century:—

Apparebit repentina,
  Dies magna Domini;
Fur obscurâ velut nocte,
  Improvisos occupans!
Brevis totus tunc parebit
  Prisci luxus seculi,
Totum simul cum clarebit
  Praeterisse seculum!
Clangor tubæ per quaternas
  Terræ plagas concinens
Vivos unâ mortuosque
  Christo ciet obviam!

Things to Come, practically inquired into. By the Rev. CHRISTOPHER BOWEN, M.A. Bath: Binns and Goodwin. 1849.

VERY excellent, practical, and scriptural. It is another testimony added to the many now lifted to proclaim the coming and kingdom of the Lord Jesus.

Digitized by Google

The Reign of Christ, both spiritual and personal; three Lectures, &c. By W. G. RHIND. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1849.

THERE is much here fitted to illustrate the subject of Christ's reign, and to open up the word of God regarding it. It may be useful to the inquirer.

Extracts.

Chiliasm in the Seventeenth Century.

"SIR JAMES STUART, of Goodtrees, told me, 'that one Mr. Fowler in England (he preached the first anniversary, or second, of the 30th January, on 1 Sam. xxvi. 16, "Ye are worthy to die, because ye kept not the Lord's anointed,") was the first that did make him incline to think the one thousand years would begin with the personal appearance of Christ to judge the wicked, and to destroy Antichrist with his personal appearance, and the brightness of his face. He thinks the day of judgment will then begin; that the Church will grow still lower and lower till then—for when he cometh shall he find faith on the earth? That Christ must reign till all his enemies be made his footstool, and bring them down himself. That he comes again to receive his kingdom. To this, likewise, he refers the parable of the Ten Virgins, and insists much on 1 Cor. xv. 22, when his coming he understands of the beginning of the one thousand years, and there is a vast space between that and his delivering the kingdom to his Father. (ver. 24.) He told me he heard Mr. Fowler very peremptory in a sermon about it; he told them that he was an old man, and would not see it; but there were some there that would not taste of death till the Son of Man came in his kingdom."—*Wodrow's Analecta*, vol. i. p. 276.

"To begin with Mr. James Bonar, I have heard two accounts of him. During the civil wars in England, and the growth of errors, some accounts came of the revival of the Millenary opinion; and one day, after dinner with the Presbytery, the brethren fell a talking about Christ's coming personally at the beginning of the one thousand years, and some, *argumentandi causa*, defending it, and others, with some warmth, opposing it. Mr. Bonar did not mix in, but sat silent. At length somebody says, 'Father Bonar, what are your sentiments?' He answered, 'Truly, I know not when our Lord will come, nor whether the one thousand years be near at hand, or to begin in my time, but if I live till our Lord Jesus come, this one thing I know, that I shall make him as welcome as any of you all.'"—*Ibid.*

Digitized by Google

Postponement of the Advent in prosperous Times.

SPEAKING of *Hippolytus* having written a treatise "concerning Antichrist," and a "Commentary on Daniel," Neander remarks, that we are told he set the end of the world at 500 years after the birth of Christ, and adds: "In the circumstance of his fixing on a period more remote than it was commonly represented to be in the early Church, we discern the effect of the tranquil times which the Church then enjoyed under Alexander Severus."—(Vol. ii. p. 473.)

"*Watch.*"

"LET us not therefore be wanting to ourselves, disregarding the most diligent premonition and prophecy of Christ our Saviour; but seeing in our age the signs foretold by him do often come to pass, let us not think that the coming of Christ is far off. And now let us look up with heads lifted up, and let us expect our Redeemer's coming with a longing and cheerful mind. For though the signs may seem uncertain, yet no man can despise them without danger; seeing there can be not only no danger, but also great profit, if reckoning them as true, thou shalt prepare thyself to meet thy Saviour, that is, if bidding farewell to present things, thou shalt be wholly taken up with the desire of the kingdom of God that is coming. Let us follow certain things, and the signs we have lately seen brought forth; let us not doubt but that they are true signs of the last day, lest we stumble with those profane men of the world, and meet with sudden destruction when we shall promise nothing but quietness to ourselves."—*Luther.*

Apostolicity of Chiliasm.

"IT appears manifestly, out of the book of Irenæus, that the doctrine of the Chiliasts was, in his judgment, apostolic tradition, as also it was esteemed (for aught appears to the contrary) by all the doctors and saints and martyrs of or about his time; for all that speak of it, or whose judgments in the point are any way recorded, are for it; and Justin Martyr professeth that all good and orthodox Christians of his time believed it, and those who did not he reckons heretics."—*Chillingworth*, p. 331.

"THE cause why Dionysius of Alexandria suspected the Apocalypse, and why others openly rejected it, was the doctrine of the Millennial reign of Christ on the earth; which doctrine, as Caius and Dionysius strenuously impugned, and were unable to overturn the arguments of the Apocalypse, they endeavoured to weaken and subvert the book itself."—*Mills'* "*Prolegomena.*"

Digitized by Google

Apocalyptica Cabbala: or, a History of the Millennium. Which shews the great Revolutions, Changes, and Accidents that will happen to the whole Moral, Animal, Vegetable, Marine, Mundane, and Æthereal World, even to the End of the World. Humbly dedicated to the Collegians of Oxford and Cambridge. Unto whom the Author appeals for a Verdict, desiring to be weighed in their ballance, and to be heard at their Judgment Seat. Written in the year of our Lord, 1726.

Having of't heard disputes and contentions among men concerning the *Millennium*, or the thousand years of *Christ's* personal reign on earth, did for a long time think it a mere romance; until I happened on a book of Mr. Perry's inditing; the which, upon perusal, I found in great measure consonant to God's Word; so that ever since I have taken that text in a literal sense, which says, *Acts* i. 11, *That the same Jesus, which was taken up into heaven, shall so come in like manner as he was seen go into heaven;* that is to say: *As the Son of God personally ascended from earth to heaven even so I believe that at the time of the restitution, he will personally descend from heaven to earth, to judge both the quick and the dead.*

Notwithstanding, I believe, that at the very time of his descension, he will not immediately pronounce the blessing to the righteous, and the curse to the wicked; but I believe, according to the words of St. *John, Rev.* xx. 6, *That after he is descended, he will personally reign on earth one thousand years with the elect;* which will be the time of their being judged and blessed: and that, at the end of the thousand years, he will call the wicked to judgment, will pronounce sentence against them, and will cast them into the lake of fire and brimstone; according to the words of St. *John, Rev.* xx. 7—10.

Yes, I say, I believe that *Jesus Christ*, at the time of the restitution, mentioned in *Acts* iii. 21, will personally descend to his people; *viz.*, will descend to earth along with his people; for St. *Paul* says, 1 *Thess.* iv. 17, *Those that are alive and remain, shall be caught up together in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air;* therefore, according to the 1 *Thess.* iv. 16, *With the saints will he descend with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God;* and so according to the words of St. *John, Rev.* xx. 4, will live and reign with them, and they with him (on earth), one thousand years.

At which time, the saints may very truly sing, and say, as 'tis written in *Isaiah* xxv. 9, *Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation; for in this mountain shall the hand of the Lord rest.*

This mountain, of which the Lord by this *prophet*, in divers places so extraordinarily speaks, I think, is spoken of this earth, which at the time of the restitution of all things, will not be absolutely destroyed and annihilated; for 'tis plain by the whole Scripture, particularly by the 3d chap. of the 2d of *Peter*, that this earth, the visible heavens, and the elements, shall only be purged and refined with a certain extraordinary fire; for as saith St. *Peter* in the 13th verse: "We,

Digitized by Google

according to *Christ's* promise, look for new heavens and a new earth ;" that is to say, We, according to the sense of the 12th verse, look that the heavens and the earth which are now, shall, (at the time of the restitution, be transformed and renewed by fire, into that most excellent state of purity that they were in before *Adam's* transgression ; which new heavens and new earth shall remain for ever and ever ; as it is evident by the whole Scriptures, particularly by *Isa.* lxvi. 22.

Yea, the present heavens and earth shall certainly be absolutely purged by fire, at the restitution ; for we are to understand, that the same fire that is to destroy and consume the things of this world, as they are at present, will also refine and purifie the same: so that not only all venom, infection, and corruption whatsoever, shall be absolutely destroyed, but also ever after all antipathy amongst the animals shall entirely cease, insomuch that *that* greedy, devouring, merciless nature, which, by accident, is interspersed in the ordinary nature of the irrational creatures, and which has been in them ever since *Adam's* fall, shall at this time, be absolutely rooted out, and taken from them ; and they shall be restored to the primitive state, innocence, and beauty, that they were in before the earth and they were cursed for *Adam's* rebellion; yea, according to *Isa.* xi. 6—9, the very irrational creatures shall be so restored, as that "the wolf shall (really) dwell with the lamb, the leopard shall lie down with the kid ; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together ; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together : and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den. They (saith the Lord) shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain : for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

Which words of *Isaiah* St. *Paul* also confirms in *Rom.* viii., for he says, *That the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God; for the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him that hath subjected the same in hope; because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God;* that is to say, the very animals that are alive at the time of the dissolution, shall indeed be changed, shall become immortal, and shall ever after be without pain or sickness, &c.

I believe, also, that this earth at the time of the restitution will be so purified by fire, that it will be equal to, if not exceed, that paradise which *Adam* and *Eve* enjoyed before their fall ; for, saith the Lord of *Hosts, Isa.* xxv. 6, *In this mountain* (*viz.*, in the new earth) *will I make unto all people, a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wine on the lees well refined;* this feast of fat things, here spoken of, besides the literal sense, undoubtedly has also a spiritual sense, such as the peace, and love, and joy there is in the *Holy Ghost;* the which, whosoever witness without doubt, does witness a perpetual feast of fat things within themselves ; but yet, to take this text in the literal sense, and in the

Digitized by Google

sense the *prophet* here speaks it, then will appear that this text, with several others that I intend hereafter to mention, does properly relate to the new heavens and new earth, in which *Christ* and the saints will reign; therefore, to understand the text above in the sense the *prophet* speaks it, *viz.*, *of* Christ's *empire on earth;* it will then evidently appear, that those who shall be thought worthy to partake of the first resurrection, shall be made citizens and priests of the new earth; where also, according to *Rev.* xxii. 1, 2, *They shall drink of the water of life, and shall eat of the tree of life;* and also, according to the text above, shall have a feast of fat things full of marrow, a feast of wines on the lees well refined; the truth of which, our *Saviour* also confirms, when he says, *Matt.* xxvi. 29, *That he would no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until he drank it new with his redeemed in his Father's kingdom.*

From what has been said, it appears that the heavens and the earth which are now, are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men; nevertheless, as saith St. *Peter,* (2 *Pet.* iii. 13,) *We, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness:* likewise we read, that St. *Paul,* (1 *Thess.* iv. 13) would not have his brethren ignorant or sorrowful, for those that are dead in the Lord, but believe that God will bring them with him; for he says, in the 16th verse, *The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the arch-angel, and with the trumpet of God, and that the dead* in Christ *shall rise first.* We read here of a first resurrection, and if there be a first resurrection, then consequently, there must be a second; not that there is actually a two-fold resurrection of one and the same person; but when I speak of the resurrection, I make a distinction, and call the resurrection, the first and second resurrection, and I call it so, because of the distance of time that there will be betwixt the resurrection of the righteous and the resurrection of the wicked; for Scripture plainly declares, that the just will be raised one thousand years before the wicked; for saith St. *John, Rev.* xx. 5, *The rest of the dead* (*viz.* the wicked) *lived not again, till the thousand years were finished;* but St. *John* saith, verse 6, *Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection, on such the second death shall have no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him one thousand years;* which matter I intend to set in a more clear light hereafter.

Digitized by Google

Correspondence.

DOES THE CONFLAGRATION OF THE EARTH TAKE PLACE AT THE SECOND ADVENT; OR IS IT A POST-MILLENNIAL EVENT?

To the Editor of the " Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

SIR,—The Prophet Isaiah, and the Apostles Peter and John have expressly intimated to us, that, after the dissolution of the heavens and earth that now are, a new heavens and a new EARTH shall be manifested, which God " will create."

To the right understanding of that subject, however, and of many most material circumstances and events connected, or associated therewith, it becomes most important to ascertain—not the absolute chronological period of its occurrence—but the time of its accomplishment *relatively*, in so far as respects its connexion with other events. In short, the question is—will that great event take place PRE-millennially, or POST-millennially?

Sir, the great importance of this point, in all its bearings and consequences, is so manifest, that I do hope you will kindly afford me a little space in your Journal for bringing this subject specially before your readers, who, I trust, may soon prove a goodly host. A periodical, such as you now edit, was very much required; and if its pages shall be open, as I have no doubt they will be, to all fair investigation of prophetical subjects, discussed in a gentle, forbearing, and Christian spirit, it will prove, by God's blessing, an instrument of incalculable good to the Christian Church. Opinions may differ, but what of that? —it will only serve to elicit truth; and by the spread of *truth* God is glorified, and great, indeed, is the progress that has been made, within the last few years, in prophetical interpretation.

But, to return to the immediate subject of this paper. Christians who quite concur in the conviction of the second advent of our Lord being pre-millennial, nevertheless seem to entertain different views with respect to the relative period of the dissolution of the present, and the creation of the new heavens and the new earth—just as they do with respect to the right interpretation of the Apocalypse, as to whether the greater portion of that book be now an accomplished history, or whether it is still to be considered as unaccomplished prophecy. If these differences could be removed by a calm and dispassionate investigation of the word of God, it would prove a blessed consummation; and may we all join in the prayer—that truth, and not party—the glory of God, and not man's theory, may be the end and aim of all.

It appears to me, that those—and I believe they are not a few—who believe the manifestation of the " new earth" to be PRE-millennial, rest their belief, chiefly, on the sixty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, and the third chapter of the Second Epistle of St. Peter. It would be quite unreasonable in me to ask for so much space in your pages—which may be much more ably occupied by others—as would enable me to take up these passages in detail, or to argue out the subject in its due and legitimate length and breadth. All I can hope for is, that you will kindly permit me just to offer a few hints for the consideration of your readers; and not without a hope that the subject may attract more of the attention of others, who may be far better able than I am, to give body and substance to a matter so important in all its connexions.

First, then, with regard to the passage in Isaiah, just referred to, I would

Digitized by Google

observe, very briefly, that the above opinion seems to rest on the supposition that the particular events recorded in, and from the 18th verse to the end of that chapter, are the details of circumstances flowing from, and depending on, the great truth announced in the verse immediately preceding. That the first-mentioned verses are descriptive of the millennial age, I suppose no one doubts. But, the point in question rests on the nature of the connexion of these with the preceding declaration, in the 17th verse.

All who hold the millennial views will probably admit that *an earth* will continue to exist after the general, or final judgment; and that *that* earth will be the *new* earth, whether its creation be *pre*, or *post*-millennial. Referring, then, to the last eight verses of the sixty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, we find some descriptive circumstances stated, particularly in the twentieth verse, which we do not think can be applied to a post-millennial state—beyond which, last, we have no revelation of any further change. But leaving that consideration for the present, I think that the apparent difficulty admits of the following natural solution. The seventeenth verse contains a declaration of the ultimate purpose of God, as determined in the eternal counsels of His will, to renew man's inheritance—ruined and marred by the fall. This great and special truth being thus revealed, the prophet, speaking in Jehovah's name, next proceeds to call the attention of His peculiar chosen people, Israel, to that which *more immediately concerns them*, as connected with His future purposes in their restoration to their own land, and the promised blessings. It may be thus paraphrased—I shall create, indeed, new heavens and a new earth, when these now existing shall have passed away; BUT, in the meantime, be ye, oh my people Israel! glad, and rejoice in that which more immediately concerns you—for, behold! I create *Jerusalem* a rejoicing, and *her* people a joy. Look ye first to *that*, as embracing the national promises made to you in all the prophets.

As respects the third chapter of the Second Epistle of St. Peter, which has, perhaps, proved the chief stumbling-block in the way of this subject, I can only offer a few very brief remarks, for the consideration of your readers, as an attempt to argue out the subject, in all its proofs and details, would occupy too much of your valuable Journal.

From the seventh verse of that chapter, we learn that the dissolution, by fire, of the existing heavens and earth is reserved until "the day of judgment, and perdition of ungodly men." And we find by the tenth verse, that it is in "the day of the Lord," in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, the elements melt with a fervent heat, and the earth, and the works therein, shall be burned up. But, nevertheless, as intimated in the twelfth verse, we are to look, according to His promise, for a new heavens and a *new earth*, wherein dwelleth righteousness.

The first point which seems to demand consideration here, is the true signification of the term "day." The day of judgment—the day of perdition of ungodly men—and the day of the Lord, if not absolutely synonymous terms, are here used collaterally as terms synchronizing in time; and what the nature and duration of that day is, seems intimated to us in the eighth verse, where we are told that "one day is with the Lord as *a thousand* years, and a thousand years as one day."

It would be superfluous to prove here what is so generally admitted, that the term "day" is frequently employed in Scripture, quite *indefinitely;* and is, in fact, used, as denoting and embracing the whole of the present dispensation, which is the day, or *season* (as the word is often translated) of grace. Just so—the day of judgment occupies the whole of the millennial day—or peculiar reign of Christ with his risen saints; during which time "a Prince shall reign in righteousness, and execute justice and judgment on the earth."

Secondly, the *perdition* of ungodly men is not wholly and finally consummated *immediately at* the second advent, because it is expressly intimated to us, in Rev. xx. 7—10, that, AT THE END of the millennial day—or the one thousand years—multitudes of the rebellious Gentile hosts of Gog and Magog shall

Digitized by Google

be devoured by fire from heaven—just as a portion of the armies of the Gog and Magog of Ezekiel shall be *at the commencement* of that period; and, besides, "the day of the *perdition* of the ungodly" cannot properly be considered to be closed, until the final separation of the wicked from the righteous, and the casting of the former into Gehenna, as the ultimate act of their perdition, and which is, unquestionably, *post*-millennial.

It follows, therefore, that if the dissolution, by fire, of the present heavens and earth be consummated in any portion of *that day*, or season,—no matter what may be its duration, or whether at its commencement, or at its termination, though these should be separated by a thousand years—the prophecy would meet with its full accomplishment.

It forms no valid argument against this view, to adduce such passages as the following—"Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence: *a fire shall devour before him*," &c.—"*a fire goeth before him*, and burneth up his enemies round about"—and others to the same effect; for, be it carefully observed, that not one of these passages speak of the dissolution of the earth itself at that time. They only denounce a partial judgment on man himself, by fire, and do not imply the burning up of the earth. There are, indeed, two or three passages of Scripture which speak of a judgment by fire on the earth itself, as taking place at the advent, such as Isaiah xxxi. 33; also xxxiv. 8—10. But these judgments are entirely of a partial nature, and limited in extent, such as was the judgment on Sodom and Gomorrah, and also imply their *subsequent* continuance, or duration on earth, in such manner as to prove their total inapplicability to the general conflagration of the heavens and the earth, which terminates in the creation of the new earth.

It has been objected to the view which would fix down the passing away of the present earth, to give place to the new earth, as a *post*-millennial event, (though St. John in the twentieth and twenty-first chapters of Revelation expressly associates it with the great events of that period), that it would contradict such statements as are found in Daniel, chapters ii. and vii.—that when the Son of Man comes to receive His kingdom, it is a kingdom "which shall never be destroyed," that it is "an everlasting kingdom," &c., and in St. Luke i. 30—33, "and the Lord shall give unto Him the throne of His father David, and He shall reign over the house of Jacob; and of His kingdom *there shall be no end*." Hence it is argued, that if the world is to be destroyed *post*-millennially, it would, at the same time, destroy that kingdom which is declared to be indestructible.

It is impossible to discuss this question here at length. It would occupy too much space. I can only, therefore, throw out a few very brief remarks in reply.

The above argument is like a two-edged sword. It cuts both ways. It would be equally, if not more, fatal to such promises as the following: "And they shall dwell in THE LAND that I have given unto Jacob my servant, WHEREIN YOUR FATHERS HAVE DWELT, AND THEY SHALL DWELL THEREIN; they, and their children, and their children's children for ever; and my servant David shall be their Prince for ever." (Ezek. xxxvii. 25. See verses from 20 to 28.) Now, it seems quite manifest, on the hypothesis that the earth is to be clean dissolved *immediately* at the second advent; that then, and in that case, the Jews would never inherit or enjoy the promises *at all*, in connexion with that *identical land* which God had sworn to give them, or with the future glory of Jerusalem, which is to be rebuilt on "its own heap." If, then, the *post*-millennial view be considered subversive of Christ's everlasting dominion, the *pre*-millennial view would, to say the least, be equally subversive of the very many promises that are given to Israel, in connexion with the identical land of Canaan.

Independently, however, of the clear statement of John, which fixes the passing away of the present earth, to give place to the new creation at the period of the general resurrection and judgment, and in connexion with other

Digitized by Google

great POST-millennial events, I would observe, that though it is said that Christ and his servants shall reign for ever and ever, (Rev. xxii. 5,) and that of His kingdom there shall be no end; yet it is equally distinctly stated that the saints of the first resurrection "shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." (Rev. xx. 6.)

Now, everybody will surely allow that *the thousand years* must have an *end*—because a thousand years is a limited and definite period; but it does not follow, because Christ gives up the peculiar and distinctive character of the millennial throne, at the final judgment and completion of the grand work of man's redemption, that he necessarily ceases to reign altogether. The nature and circumstances of that reign may indeed be altered; and man may no longer require the peculiar offices of a Redeemer, but Christ, in man's nature glorified, will ever continue to reign, not only over man's inheritance—the earth, but as the representative of the invisible Godhead over all creation, when the earth may have become a component part of the one universal kingdom, embracing the whole material creation of God—man's inheritance being no longer a fallen and disjointed orb.

Neither does the circumstance of the *post*-millennial creation of the new earth in the least degree nullify the fact, that, as a consequence of the second advent, wars shall cease—peace and harmony prevail—fruitful seasons bless the labours of man, and great physical changes take place on the globe; for then "the *times* of restitution of all things" COMMENCE—"the times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord;" but all things are not *thus* renewed, nor all changes finally completed. Death and the curse are not effectually, nor for ever, removed, until the general judgment; and it is not until "the former things are passed away," and the New Jerusalem has descended on the new earth, that the blessed words are pronounced, "IT IS DONE."

The great anxiety I feel to avoid encroaching on your pages has obliged me to handle this question in so superficial a manner, as to occasion the omission of many important circumstances and considerations bearing upon it; and which would have tended to elucidate the point more clearly. Will you permit me instead, to add, in conclusion, a condensed summary of reasons for fixing the relative period of the dissolution of the elements by fire, and the creation of the new heavens and the new earth, to be at, or subsequent to, the general judgment, and not immediately *at* the second advent, as some suppose:—

1. The millennial earth cannot be the "*new earth*," because it is not entirely renovated; nor *all sin* and its *consequences* completely eradicated *at* the second advent, as may be gathered from the following passages amongst others: Zech. viii. 4; Isa. lxv. 20; Ezek. xliv. 25; Jer. xxxi. 27—30; see particularly verse 30.

2. Because the nations are threatened with *punishment*, in the event of their refusing to serve Israel, or to go up from time to time to worship the King—the Lord of hosts, at Jerusalem. And the judgments denounced are—drought, plague, smiting, *perishing*, and wasting; all of which are totally incompatible, even in supposition, with the character and condition of the "new earth, in which dwelleth righteousness." (Zech. xiv. 16—19; Rev. xx. 7—9.)

3. Because death and the grave still continue on the millennial earth. For however much the former may be under subjection, or in abeyance, it is not finally destroyed; and the graves, still retaining their corruption on the earth, do not yield up their wicked dead, until the general judgment, when death and Hades are, for ever, cast into the lake of fire.

4. Because, when the thousand years are "fulfilled," Satan shall be again loosed from his temporary prison, (Rev. xx. 3 and 7,) and permitted once more to tempt the human race. This cannot be on the "new earth," where there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, (Rev. xxi. 1—9;) nor where, I conceive, shall Satan ever be permitted to set foot.

5. Because Satan shall *succeed* in raising a most extensive rebellion of the

Digitized by Google

Gentile nations, "the number of whom is as the sand of the sea;" and they shall go up "on the breadth of the earth to compass the camp of the saints, and the beloved city," (Jerusalem,—see Rev. xx. 7—10,) which brings on the general judgment, and the passing away of the heavens and the earth, to give place to the new creation of God. (Rev. xx. 11, to end, and xxi. 1—8.)

6. Because the nations of Gog and Magog, thus seduced, are, at the end of the millennium, devoured by fire from heaven (Rev. xx. 9), just as a portion of the *pre*-millennial Gog and Magog of Ezekiel are, in like manner, destroyed at its commencement, (Ezek. xxxviii. 22,) and no such destruction could take place on the new earth. (Rev. xxi. 1—5.) The "*day* of the perdition of ungodly men," commencing with the judgment of the quick *at* the second advent, and terminating with the resurrection of the wicked, at what is usually called the general judgment, cannot, therefore, close until the termination of the millennial *day*—which constitutes "the *day* of judgment," or righteous rule and execution of justice on earth during the reign of Christ with his risen saints.

7. Because on the millennial earth the "SEA" shall undoubtedly continue to exist as at present, though its storms and tempests may be lulled into gentle and genial breezes; for, at the end of the thousand years, at the general judgment, "the SEA shall give up THE DEAD which were IN IT," (Rev. xx. 13,) while on the new earth "THERE SHALL BE NO MORE SEA." (Rev. xxi. 1.) This appears to me, I must confess, to be conclusive of the question, even if there was no other argument in favour of the *post*-millennial view, which is far from being the case, for it is impossible that the sea can exist, and not exist, at one and the same time; or that an earth which has no sea can be the same with one which has. Surely no true millenarian will argue that the term "sea" is to be understood *literally* in the one verse, and *figuratively* in the other. A straightforward perusal of the context will convey no such idea; and to admit that, would be just sanctioning the mistaken and illogical system of reasoning which would make the *first* resurrection a *figurative* one, and the resurrection of "the *rest* of the dead," mentioned in the same chapter, a *literal* one. On such a system of interpretation the trumpet would give but an uncertain sound.

8. Because it is clearly intimated that the inferior animals shall continue to inhabit the earth during the millennium; and therefore, if the dissolution of the earth by fire, and the melting of the elements by fervent heat, as described by the Apostle Peter, were to take place immediately at the second advent, it would follow, as a necessary consequence, that the brute creation would be miraculously preserved during that awful judicial catastrophe, to inhabit the new heavens and the new earth, which appears, in so far as revealed, to be the eternal state. It may be so—but I see nothing that necessarily warrants that supposition.

9. Because we are informed that, during the millennium, there "shall be old men and old women dwelling in the streets of Jerusalem, (the holy city,) and every man with *his staff* in his hand for very age." (Zech. viii. 4.) This implies *decay* and bodily *decrepitude*, tending towards, if not actually ending in, death itself—a condition of things quite opposed to the character of the new earth, where "there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, *for the former things are passed away*," and "*all things made new*." (Rev. xxi. 4, 5.) And on that earth "there shall be no more curse," nor any evil consequences of the fall of man remaining.

10. Because we have numerous details given respecting the rebuilding of Jerusalem on its present site—on its own little hill; the new division and location of the twelve tribes in existing localities, bordered by the "sea;" all the land, also, shall be turned as a plain from Geba to Rimmon, south of Jerusalem," (Zech. xiv. 10, 11,) and many other circumstances, too tedious to enumerate here, all applicable to this present earth, and many to certain localities, which seem to be entirely at variance with the supposition that the present earth is to be destroyed *pre*-millennially.

Digitized by Google

And, lastly, because "the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men" does not *close* till all the rebellious nations are destroyed, and death and Hades cast into the lake of fire, which is not until the termination of the thousand years. "The *last enemy* that shall be destroyed is death." (1 Cor. xv. 22—26.) It is true, as respects the saints of the *first* resurrection, that "death is (THEN) swallowed up in victory." (Isa. xxv. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 54.) But that *victory* over death and the grave is confined to them alone. It is not, *then*, a general truth; neither is that expression equivalent to the declaration, that "there shall be NO MORE death," in Rev. xxi. 4, which explicitly applies to the *post*-millennial state, and to the "new earth," when "former things have passed away, and all things are made new."

I remain, Sir, very faithfully yours,

GEO. OGILVY.

The Cove, Dumfriesshire, 5th March, 1849.

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

SIR,—In reading the work of Mr. Frere upon the "Great Continental Revolution of 1848," I was struck with some remarks of his upon the *powers* of numbers, and commenced an investigation to which I would venture, through your assistance, to call the attention of arithmeticians and chronologists.

After submitting every year since the Creation to arithmetical tests, it was impossible to avoid being struck by the very great peculiarities presented by the number 4096, peculiarities which exist in no other number under the world's present age.

It is 2^{12}, 4^6, 8^4, 16^3, 64^2.
Its half is 2^{11}.
Its quarter is 32^2, 2^{10}, 4^5.
Its eighth part is 8^2, 2^9.
Its sixteenth part is 16^2, 2^8, 4^4.
Its 32d part is 2^7.
Its 64th part is 8^2, 4^3, 2^6.
Its 128th part is 2^5.
Its 256th part is 4^2, 2^4.
Its 512th part is 2^3.
Its 1024th part is 2^2.

If the science of numbers had any part in the councils of the great arithmetician, the "*wonderful numberer*," (Dan. viii. 13, *marg. rend.*,) this number 4096 might serve to fix the date of the most wonderful event which ever occurred in this world's history. It was, however, a mere supposition, and worthless, unless borne out by the evidence of history. For that evidence it is clear that we can go to the Bible only. And I think that the accompanying table, drawn entirely from that source, will prove that it is in the highest degree probable that the year 4096 Anno Mundi was the true date of the birth of the Messiah.

In drawing up these tables I have adhered to the very words of Scripture, excepting in one point. When the sacred records state that David reigned forty years, Solomon forty years, Rehoboam seventeen years, and so on, I have taken it for granted that the meaning was, that David and Solomon died in the fortieth year of their reigns, and Rehoboam in the seventeenth year of his reign, and thus I have deducted six months from the reigns of the kings of Judah, as an average, to give us an approximate result as to the duration of the whole line from David to Jehoiachin. And in doing so, I do not think that I have violently strained the text.

Josephus ("Antiq. of the Jews," book x., chap. viii., sect. 5) states, that the destruction of the Temple, in the eleventh year of Zedekiah, took place

3513 years, six months, and ten days (say 3514 years) after the creation of Adam. If we were at liberty to take this as the date of the *taking* of Jerusalem under Jehoiachin, instead of its destruction under Zedekiah, the correspondence between our calculations would be complete, Josephus having reckoned the Bondage in Egypt from the time that Jacob went there, instead of from the time when Joseph was taken there,—a difference of twenty-two years.

Thus: 3514*
22

3536 The Captivity.

It is not a little remarkable, that the dividing of the number 4096 gives the exact date of the parallel event,—the birth of Isaac.

With regard to the generally received date of the birth of the Messiah, 4004 Anno Mundi, I cannot find that it is borne out by an examination of Scripture, the only authority which ought to be recognised in a question of this nature.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Αριθμος.

Adam lived	130	years, and begat Seth . . .	Gen. v. 3.
Seth lived	105	years, and begat Enos . . .	— v. 6.
Enos lived	90	years, and begat Cainan . .	— v. 9.
Cainan lived	70	years, and begat Mahalaleel .	— v. 12.
Mahalaleel lived . . .	65	years, and begat Jared . . .	— v. 15.
Jared lived	162	years, and begat Enoch . .	— v. 18.
Enoch lived	65	years, and begat Methuselah .	— v. 21.
Methuselah lived . .	187	years, and begat Lamech . .	— v. 25.
Lamech lived	182	years, and begat Noah . . .	— v. 28.
The birth of Noah . .	1056	Anno Mundi.	
And all the days of Noah were	950	years	Gen. ix. 29.
The death of Noah . .	2006	Anno Mundi.	
But Noah lived after the Flood	350	which, being deducted, gives	Gen. ix. 28.
	1656	as the date of the Deluge.	
Shem begat Arphaxad .	2	years after the Flood . . .	Gen. xi. 10.
	1658	The birth of Arphaxad . . .	— xi.
Arphaxad lived . . .	35	years, and begat Salah . . .	— xi. 12.
Salah lived	30	years, and begat Eber . . .	— xi. 14.
Eber lived	34	years, and begat Peleg . . .	— xi. 16.
Peleg lived	30	years, and begat Reu . . .	— xi. 18.
Reu lived	32	years, and begat Serug . . .	— xi. 20.
Serug lived	30	years, and begat Nahor . .	— xi. 22.
Nahor lived	29	years, and begat Terah . .	— xi. 24.
Terah lived	70	years, and begat Abram . .	— xi. 26.
	1948	Birth of Abraham.	
The Lord appeared to Abraham when he was	99	years old	Gen. xvii. 1.
And said, "My cove-			

* I am not disposed to place much dependance upon dates given by Josephus, which rarely correspond with those derivable from Scripture.

Digitized by Google

nant will I establish with Isaac, which Sarah shall bear unto thee at this set time *in the next year.*" Therefore, add . .	1		Gen. xvii. 1.
	2048	The birth of the promised Son.	
Twice 2048	4096	The birth of the promised Son, of whom Isaac was the type, was this date, then the "*Fulness of Time.*"	

Having thus clearly proved that the birth of Isaac took place in 2048 Anno Mundi, we proceed to carry on the account to the birth of the Messiah.

	2048	Isaac's birth.	
Isaac was	60	years old when Jacob was born	Gen. xxv. 26.
	2108	Jacob's birth.	

When Joseph went into Egypt he was 17 years old (Gen. xxxvii. 2); when he stood before Pharaoh he was 30 (Gen. xli. 46). The 7 plenteous years and 2 of the years of famine had passed when his father came to Egypt. (Gen. xlv. 11.) Jacob then told Pharaoh that he was 130 (Gen. xlvii. 9), Joseph being 39, so that Joseph must have been born when Jacob was 91.

Therefore	2108	Jacob's birth.	
Add	91		
	2199	Joseph's birth.	
Joseph was	17	years old when sold into Egypt	Gen. xxxvii. 2.
	2216	The Bondage commences.	
The Bondage lasted .	430	years	Ex. xii. 40, 41.
	2646	The Exodus.	
Solomon's Temple was built	480	years after the Exodus . . .	1 Kings vi. 1.
	3126	The Temple built.	
But David had reigned 40 years, and Solomon 4 years before this: therefore deduct . .	44	years, which gives	1 Kings vii. 37.
	3082	as the date of David's accession.	
	39½	David reigned	1 Kings ii. 11.
	39½	Solomon	— xi. 42.
	16½	Rehoboam	— xiv. 21.
	2½	Abijam	— xv. 2.
	40½	Asa	— xv. 10.
	24½	Jehoshaphat	— xxii. 42.
	7½	Jehoram	2 Kings viii. 17.
	1	Ahaziah	— viii. 26.
	6	Interregnum	— xi. 3, 4.
	39½	Jehoash	— xii. 1.
	28½	Amaziah	— xiv. 2.

Digitized by Google

	51½	Azariah	2 Kings	xv. 2.
	15½	Jotham	—	xv. 33.
	15½	Ahaz	—	xvi. 2.
	28½	Hezekiah	—	xviii. 2.
	54½	Manasseh	—	xxi. 1.
	1½	Amon	—	xxi. 19.
	30½	Josiah	—	xxii. 1.
	½	Jehoahaz	—	xxiii. 31.
	10½	Jehoiakim	—	xxiii. 36.
	½	Jehoiachin	—	xxiv. 8.
	3536	The Captivity.		
	70	The Captivity lasted.		
	3606	The Captivity ends.		
Now the angel told Daniel, that from the going forth of the commandment terminating the captivity, and for the rebuilding of Jerusalem to Messiah, the Prince should be 70 weeks,* or . .	490	years		Dan. ix. 25.
	4096	The Messiah.		

IS THE APOCALYPSE FULFILLED OR UNFULFILLED?—No. III.

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

Dear Sir,—In my preceding letter I endeavoured to impress upon prophetic students, that we ought scrupulously to beware of coming to the interpretation of the Apocalypse with preconceived ideas, however popular, as to the character of its contents; that careful examination should ever precede the formation of our judgment. The danger of neglecting this, and prejudging what are worthy topics for the Divine mind to treat in prophecy, must be at once apprehended, by observing how mere human estimation has been contradicted by *the fact*, in the method of Divine *history*. Reverence to the Word of God requires, that in determining the import of what he has written, we should survey it, keeping in abeyance all our human conceptions. At the same time, as every work of God is at unity with itself, the analogy of Scripture in general may legitimately suggest to the inquirer into any portion of it (like the Apocalypse) the "*pendens questio*," as Lord Bacon has it, whereby all knowledge is so profitably sounded for. For example, to recur to the familiar illustration employed in my last, if a lock were presented to us, which we desired to open, we would naturally think of some key which to employ; and if we happened to possess other locks, with their keys, by the same maker, it would be only reasonable to try if one of these would not answer our purpose; still, however, making the trial cautiously, lest, peradventure, by pressing a wrong key, we should do injury to the lock. In like manner, as to the book of the Revelation, of which the child of God seeks the right clue of interpretation, it is quite allowable for him, being acquainted with the character of the other prophetic Scriptures, to

* 70 weeks
7
490 days, or years.

Digitized by Google

commence his researches with the tentative supposition, that God foretels "things to come" here, on the same principle; prepared, however, at once to relinquish such supposition, if he find, on actual experiment, that it suffices not for the peculiarities now presented to him. What, then, is the principle, or distinguishing characteristic of Old Testament prophecy? To determine this, let us briefly refer to a few prominent passages by way of specimen.

1. And, first, Isaiah xi. 1: "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots." Already, it is obvious, this has had its fulfilment in the incarnation and birth of our blessed Lord, occurring, as such event did, when the house of David was brought so low as that its surviving representative was, on the one hand, an obscure virgin, and, on the other, a poor carpenter. The stump of Jesse was thus almost decayed in the earth. But at length, in the person of Jesus, it sprouted out, and the auspicious language was addressed from heaven to the Jewish people: "Unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour which is Christ the Lord." The prophet proceeds: "And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge, and of the fear of the Lord; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears. But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins." (Vers. 2—5.) Now here there may be a difference of opinion as to the point, where the reference to the *first* advent ends, and that to the *second* begins; but there can be no doubt as to the fact, that there is a transition from the one to the other, wherein, although we can determine from the event the place for the insertion of our dispensation, no mention whatever is made of it. The Lord Jesus was, indeed, endued with this sevenfold energy of the Spirit, and thereby He did and suffered everything that devolved on Him, as the promised Messiah. But that He has not entered upon the career of judgment predicted, delivering the oppressed, and destroying the great oppressor, the Antichrist, is manifest. Nay, at His first coming, He emphatically declined this, saying: "Who made me a judge or a divider over you?" (Luke xii. 14.) It is at His second advent only that the season for this will have arrived. And so, the prophecy, still intermitting our dispensation, goes on to describe the harmony that shall then prevail amongst the inferior creatures: "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain." (Vers. 6—9.)

2. Let us next look at Jeremiah xxiii. 5: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch." Here, again, in the lineage and personal character of the Lord Jesus, this part of the prophecy received its fulfilment at the first advent. But the utterance which immediately ensues, as in Isaiah xi., *passes over the whole interval of this dispensation*, and relates to the second advent: "And a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth."

Now, because of this fact, that the advents of Christ are compressed together, as it were, and made one event in Old Testament prophecy, (and other instances might be cited in confirmation,) I maintained, in my pamphlet,* that this dispensation was of the nature of a parenthesis, which being taken out of the way, the future dealings of God, with the Jews and the nations, at once link themselves on to the past, and compose one uninterrupted chain of prophetic

* "Apocalyptic Interpretation."

Digitized by Google

fulfilment, centering in the Person of Messiah. From this pretermission of the times of Christianity in Old Testament prophecy, to infer that the like would probably obtain in New Testament prophecy, appeared to me to be not unreasonable; and hence, that as we look not for predictions of the affairs of Christendom in the one, so neither should we in the other. But now, what says my Reviewer against this simple analogical argument? He proceeds as follows:—

"First, it is natural to inquire, *why* the earlier prophecies all centre around the people of Israel . . . The true reason is very simple and plain. Israel were then, the covenant people of God; so long as they remained the people of the covenant, all Divine prophecy centred around them."

Now, hereupon I must observe, the writer has fallen into some serious mistakes. And, first, in his statement concerning Israel, that, "*So long as they remained the people of the covenant, Divine prophecies centred around them.*" The fact is here overlooked, that long before they had acquired nationality, Israel constituted the fruitful topic of prophecy; and even in the days of Peleg, the destined population of their tribes had to do with the territorial assignment of the earth, among the nations, (compare Deut. xxxii. 8, with Gen. x. 25.) Before, also, that any son was born to Abraham, they were contemplated in that pregnant promise to him, "In thy seed shall the nations of the earth be blessed." Nor is this all; now that they are off the stage, scattered among the nations of the earth, Divine prophecy still circles around them as much as ever; and *only as connected with them,* takes in the affairs of the world. Thus, notwithstanding that in the vista of the future, the whole history of Christendom lay open before the Divine mind, Old Testament prophecy has left it unnoticed. It took cognizance of Gentile movements antecedent to the rejection of Messiah, for in these movements were involved the interests of the Jewish nation, then sacredly related to God; it takes cognizance of such still, as concomitants of Jewish revival, in the latter days. But, of those political revolutions of the earth, meanwhile, which Gibbon and other historians have chosen to record, Old Testament prophecy is utterly unobservant.

With this correction of my Reviewer's inaccuracy, the force of his next remark will be duly appreciated:—

"Ever since the days of St. John, the Jews have not been the people of the covenant, but this privilege has been transferred to the visible Church among the Gentiles."

Here there is an implication that Israel *has ceased* to be the centre of Divine prophecy touching the nations. But against this, the reader must be on his guard. I do not say the writer intended to convey this misconception; but as it happens to be necessary for the conclusiveness of his argument, and there is something equivocal in the whole tenor of the sentence, in connexion with the context, it might not be at once detected. The fact is, then, let it again be repeated, Divine prophecy in the Old Testament *still circles around Israel.* Their present defection from God (and this is all my Reviewer can really mean) has made no alteration in this. The Gentile nations *hinge* on them equally for salvation, and prophetic recognition of their doings. And this being the case, let my Reviewer answer the question, why should we presume that New Testament prophecy, for example, the Apocalypse, in reference to the same subject, *i.e.*, Gentile affairs, would employ another centre? Granted, that now, during the disorganization of the Jews, (and already this has occupied a period of eighteen centuries,) God is gathering into a still nearer relationship to Him the present Church composed of an election from Jews and Gentiles; and that here is afforded another centre, whence prophecy might radiate anew. Yet this supports not the supposed analogy. For prophetic revelation, be it remembered, is not bestowed on any party, in order to their mere foreknowledge of the future, but because of their ordained connexion with God's designs, touching the government of the whole earth; or graciously to assure them by way of promise, of the crown of blessing, which is in reserve for themselves. Now, in the case of ISRAEL, both these ends caused Old Testament

Digitized by Google

prophecy to bear upon Gentile interests; for, in regard to their appointed settlement in the land of promise, their calling was to dispossess, and then present a model to the nations of a people governed by God. Hence the information we have about the Egyptians and the Canaanites, &c., in regard to the past, and this is just a type of the future. (See Micah iv. 7, 8.)

But, as to the CHURCH, neither does her *hope*, nor her *relation to the world*, require that prophecy, radiating from her, should treat of Gentile movements under this dispensation.

1. As to the *first*, she is not called to an inheritance among the nations, but as an election out of them, growing up heavenwards into union with her glorified Head, to depose the principalities and powers, who constitute the rulers of the darkness of this world. And, accordingly, in the Epistles, the Scriptures which directly relate to our dispensation, what meets our eye in the way of prophetic disclosure of the Church's hope, is heavenly triumph and heavenly glory. For example, "The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly." (Rom. xvi. 20.) "He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." (Rom. viii. 11.) "We which are alive, and remain, shall be caught up together to meet the Lord in the air." (1 Thess. iv. 17.) "Begotten again unto an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you." (1 Pet. i. 3, 4.)

Such are specimens of the appeals to the future, whereby the saints of God now are animated to run their heavenly race.

2. As to the Church's *relation to the world*, it is not direct, but through the intermediate link of restored Israel, which is the ordinance of God for diffusing his saving health among all nations.* Therefore, whatever rays of prophetic light the New Testament emits on this subject, in order to promote our communion with God, ought to be expected to prove concentric with those of the Old Testament which shines forth from Israel.

And here again it is interesting to perceive that with the presumption, fact corresponds, so far as the Gospels and Epistles are concerned. For therein, wherever information comes out about the weal or woe of the world, it is but a ramification of the testimony of the prophets of old to the Divine purpose concerning Israel. (See Matt. xxv. 31—46; Rom. xi. 12—15.) And to this why should it be presumed that the Apocalypse is an exception? Thus it appears Israel is still the centre of all prophetic notices about the Gentiles, and until we fix one leg of our exploring compass upon this point, all our fetches with the other, in the way of interpreting the phases of earthly events, will be but labour lost.

But now does it follow from this that the Church is without the comforting light of prophecy? So my reviewer alleges. Referring to the principle contended for, he thus closes his general condemnation of it:—

> "It infers that God will leave his covenant people, for near two thousand years, without any direct light of inspired prophecy, *because* His covenant people always enjoyed that privilege, in a dispensation of dimmer light and less abundant grace."

The answer to this is obvious from the considerations already adduced. All Scripture, including prophecy, is our portion as the Church, to gather therefrom acquaintance with the mind and ways of God. But to this end it is not necessary that the Divine communications should directly relate to us. It is enough if they relate to the glory of our Lord and Master, for we are one with Him. And since His revealed interference with the movements of the nations, is associated with the fortunes of Israel, his relations according to the flesh, we may be well content, through them, to derive our knowledge of the subject. The information God has given us concerning Gentile *history* has been conveyed in this direction; and that Gentile prophecy should unfold itself, in the same, it were reasonable to expect. Indeed, the anomaly of conclusion which my Reviewer imputes to this view had been already anticipated, and dealt with in

* Apocalyptic Interpretation, p. 67.

Digitized by Google

the appendix to my pamphlet, in reference to the objection of my friend, Mr. Bonar. But of this, my Reviewer seems not to be cognizant, though attention is drawn to it by a note *in loco*. I shall therefore repeat what is there urged, putting it into juxta-position with the expanded argument of Mr. Bonar:—

PROPHETICAL LANDMARKS.

(Page 182.)

"Judging from such analogies (those of Old Testament prophecy), we should be led to expect that the interval between the first and second comings of the Lord should in like manner be *filled up* with the events and times of prophecy. I cannot help laying much stress on these analogies of the past; they appear to me to afford a strong presumption, to say no more, in favour of the more protracted scheme of interpretation. It cannot but appear strange and inconsistent that the prophetic page, which, in all other ages of the world, had been *at length written over* with the Church's history, should all at once, for eighteen hundred years, become utterly blank; and that, during a dispensation the most momentous which has yet evolved. These considerations, though perhaps not direct proofs, do yet almost amount to something of that kind; they certainly lead us to enter on New Testament prophecies with the expectation of finding them, like preceding ones, spread out over a considerable period, not crushed together in a point, and expending themselves exclusively upon the last few years of the Church's history before, or at, the advent."

APOCALYPTIC INTERPRETATION.

(Page 86.)

"Now I submit to the reader, and to the further judgment of Mr. Bonar, whether what is implied by legitimate analogy, which he will admit is resemblance not so much between things as their relationships, really holds in this case; that is, that the Church now occupies the place of the earthly people Israel, having to do in a similar way with the nations? I at once admit that did such common relationship to the nations obtain between Israel and the Church, it would be anomalous for the predicted progress of the Church, not to involve recitals of national vicissitudes. But surely this cannot be maintained. In the one case we have a people—that of Israel—whose very 'number,' we read, had to do with the nations, when the Most High originally divided to the latter their inheritance, and separated the sons of Adam, (Deut. xxxii. 8,) and whose attainment to the earthly pre-eminence assigned to them by the Divine purpose, could not, and cannot be reached, without necessarily influencing the nations around.

"In the other case, while Israel are cast out from their land, and the nations are left to swell up in pride, we have to contemplate a secret election from among both, to heavenly glory; and of whom it is characteristically said, 'they are not of the world;' 'chosen in Christ,' we read, 'before the foundation of the world,' and 'blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ.' (Eph. i. 3, 4.)"

"In a word, Israel's calling was earthly, and therefore the record of the Divine dealings with them, of which Old Testament Scriptures mainly consist, of necessity involved the mention of earthly transactions. But the calling of the Church is heavenly, and her progress even unto the end dispenses with such recital altogether. The noise of axe and hammer need not be heard among the nations whilst

Digitized by Google

this work of the Spirit advances. Accordingly, by *analogy*, as this is the time of Israel's disorganization, from being the radiating centre of earthly arrangements, and the Church in this respect supplies not Israel's place—an hiatus in prophetic details concerning the earth should be expected."

Still hoping to pursue the subject,
I remain, yours, &c.,
JAMES KELLY.

Churton House, Belgrave-road, May 23, 1849.

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

SIR,—As it appears to be one object of your able and interesting Journal to encourage discussion regarding the all-momentous subjects of which it treats, I venture to submit to you some thoughts which occurred to my mind on reading the second and fifth articles in your January number, entitled, "Old and New Testament Apocalypse," and "The Difficulties of extreme Futurism."

The two first general positions laid down in Art. V. do not appear to me to be altogether tenable.

In the first of these the writer, while combating the extreme view which would make the Apocalypse to relate altogether to the Jew, has, I conceive, fallen into the other extreme, of making it refer altogether to the Gentile Church of this dispensation. The correct view I believe to be, that portions of it refer to Christendom in general, and portions of it to the Jewish people at the time when their destinies shall be completed.

Proofs of this latter assertion are, I think, to be found, 1. In the allusion (i. 7) to them "also who pierced Him," as interested in the revelation about to be made. (Conf. Zech. xii. 10.) 2. In the *title* given to our Lord (v. 5), "The Lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David," a title partly repeated by himself (xx. 16). 3. In the enumeration of the "hundred and forty-four thousand of all the tribes of the children of Israel,'' sealed, moreover, by an "angel ascending *from the east*." 4. In the contrast, chap. xi., between the "Holy City," with its temple, altar, and worshippers, and "the Gentiles," who "tread it under foot." 5. In the description of the woman, chap. xii., answering probably to the Jewish people, already represented by similar imagery in Joseph's dream (Gen. xxxvii. 9), and at the time of the vision expecting Messiah when about to be brought a second time into the world,—a time when, as we learn from other prophecies, they shall be the object of fierce persecution. 6. In the distinction made in the last verse of the same chapter between the woman and "the rest of her seed." 7. In the selection of the spot for the last pre-millennial conflict, "called, in the Hebrew tongue, Armageddon." Even Mr. Elliott, in his "Horæ Apocalypticæ," argues from the "Alleluia" (xix. 3, 4, 6) being Hebrew, that the Jewish people are here introduced.

As regards the dedication of the book to seven Churches with *Gentile* names, this does not prove that these Churches were wholly composed of Gentiles,—it is highly probable that many of them were Hellenist Jews; just as St. Peter addresses his first epistle to the strangers scattered throughout the same region, who are supposed to have been chiefly Jews. This supposition is strengthened by the language addressed (ii. 9) to the Church of Smyrna,—"I know the blasphemy of them which *say they are Jews and are not*."

If, moreover, the name "Antipas," being Gentile, would indicate that the Church of Pergamos was Gentile; the name "Jezebel" (ii. 20) would, *pari ratione*, indicate that the Church of Thyatira was Jewish.

Digitized by Google

The quotation from the new song of the redeemed, "Thou hast redeemed us to God . . . . . out of every kindred," &c., would rather prove that the Jews were included; while the vision (chap. vii.) of the great multitude of all nations seems very probably to denote both Gentiles and Jews at the future "gathering of the just" in the one flock, seen now by anticipation, being suggested by the particular mention of *Jews* in the previous vision, and introduced to show that God's blessing was not to be confined to these alone.

I find an incidental confirmation of this view in the fourth article of the same number of your Journal, pp. 136-7, where the writer, in support of his statement that the New Testament recognises the nationality of the Jews, quotes a tract of Dr. M'Caul's, in which he says, "It is clearly proved that the New Testament preserves the distinctive appellation of *Israel* and *Gentiles* in their Old Testament sense."

The remark, that "the Jew is lost sight of during the present dispensation, save as an outcast, or as gathered in among the Gentiles," applies, not to "extreme Futurism," but to the Futurist theory, which supposes the Apocalypse is to be fulfilled during this dispensation; but it loses sight of the Futurist position, (not here disputed,) that the Apocalypse relates to events occurring towards *the very close* of this dispensation, at which time, according to the views of most pre-millenarian expositors, the Jews shall re-appear on the stage, and the natural branches be graffed in again. "The Times of the Gentiles," during which, the writer affirms, "the Jew is hidden," do not necessarily describe the whole of the present dispensation. They may, as I believe they do, refer to the times of Gentile tyranny against Israel under the beast, the future siege and treading down of Jerusalem, described by our Lord in the prophecy where the expression occurs, as well as in Rev. xi., Zech. xiv., &c.

The *second* proposition, that "the promises and blessings mentioned in the Apocalypse relate not to what is earthly, but to what is heavenly," appears to me to be also incorrect.

The meaning of this rather obscure expression is explained in the more enlarged statement made of the same subject in Art. II., from which it would seem that by "the heavenly" is meant, the condition of the glorified saints during the Millennium, who are to reign with Christ, dwelling in the pavilion-cloud, or New Jerusalem, distinct from, but connected with the earth: and by "the earthly," the condition of Israel and the converted nations of the world abiding in the earthly Jerusalem and the cities of the earth. The promises of the Apocalypse, the writer observes, refer almost exclusively to the former, and those of the Old Testament very much, if not nearly all, to the latter.

Doubtless, in the millennial kingdom there will be some such distinction. I cannot, however, perceive that one series forms the almost exclusive subject of the Old Testament prophecy, and another series of the New. The very instance cited by the author (Art. V.) in support of his view, from Rev. ii. 7, to my mind proves the contrary, describing, as it does, an apparent revival of the original Eden. Indeed, in Art. II., the condition of Eden is adduced as an example of the earthly, the opposite of the use made of it here. The exemption of the hundred and forty-four thousand from the inflictions of the trumpets is another instance in the Apocalypse of the earthly. What shall we say, too, of "the camp of the saints and the beloved city" compassed by Gog and Magog? Is this earthly or heavenly? The blessings proclaimed, chap. xxi. 3—6, seem undoubtedly earthly, as well as the description, vers. 24—27 of the same chapter; at least, there is a very close connexion set forth between the earthly and heavenly. The mention also of there being "no more curse" (chap. xxii. 3) suggests strongly a reference to the earth.

The parallelism traced in Art. II. between the prophecies of Ezekiel and of St. John rather proves, not that a different series is described by each, but that they are treating the same subject; sometimes both of them the same parts of it, and sometimes one the earthly, the other the heavenly. The sealed ones of Ezekiel and of John seem to be the same. The roll eaten by Ezekiel

Digitized by Google

and the little book eaten by John appear also identical, and so of other parts. While Ezekiel's city is probably the earthly Jerusalem, and John's the heavenly,* but neither is confined to the one or the other series. For instance, if the resurrection of Ezekiel xxxvii. be literal, which every pre-millenialist will admit, then its subjects must form a portion of the glorified saints,—the heavenly.

The difference between the two prophecies seems more properly to be, that Ezekiel was to prophesy rather of punishment to Israel, though also of punishment on Gentile nations; John of punishment on Jew and Gentile; Ezekiel of earthly and heavenly blessings for the Jew; John of the earthly and heavenly for all, both Jew and Gentile.

With the third position laid down in Art. V. most Futurists will agree, viz., that "a large portion of the Apocalypse must have its fulfilment before the second coming of the Lord." The interpretations of the title, "The Apocalypse of Jesus Christ," and of the phrase, "the Lord's-day," (i. 10), on which the opposite hypothesis mainly rests, are, I think, wholly unsupported by the context in which the expressions stand, by the general contents of the book, and by the analogy of the New Testament language.

I am, Sir, respectfully yours, W.

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

Sir,—As you are not averse to the reception of such brief and suitable remarks as may be conveyed to you, in reference to the momentous subjects to which your pages are specially devoted, I would venture to offer a few observations on the Greek phrase κυριακη ἡμερα, the meaning of which has been discussed at some length in your second number.

The expression occurs in Rev. i. 10, and is rendered in our version "Lord's-day." It has been usually understood to mean the first day of the week; but there are those who conceive that it has the same signification as the words that are to be so frequently met with in the Sacred Volume, ἡμερα κυριου, "the day of the Lord," and is therefore applicable to the time of the coming of the Lord from heaven.

It appears to me that the generally-received interpretation is the correct one, that the first day of the week is that which is intended; but that the common rendering, "Lord's-day," while admissible on account of its conventional signification, does not fully express the import of the original.

The etymology of κυριακος should be taken into consideration. It is not a classical word; it seems to be altogether of a New Testament origin, and to have been coined for New Testament purposes. It occurs twice in the inspired writings, namely, in 1 Cor. xi. 20, qualifying the noun δειπνον, and in Rev. i. 10, qualifying the noun ἡμερα.

I think it is generally overlooked that κυριακος is the Greek term from which our word *church* is derived. Putting the Greek word into English letters (*kyriakos* or *kuriakos*), the transition to *kirk* with *k* hard, or *church*, with the same letter softened into *ch*, is readily perceivable.

Now, it is admitted that the word "kirk," or "church," signifies, "house of the Lord,"—κυριου οικος, contracted into κυριακος; so that the literal rendering of κυριακη ἡμερα is *Lord's house day*, or *church day*, a very appropriate name for that day, on which was held the εκκλησια, or assembly of the saints, described in 1 Tim. iii. 15, as οικος Θεου, "the house of God," which description may be considered as justifying our translators in rendering εκκλησια by the word "church," in the numerous passages in which it has respect to that assembly.

In like manner, in 1 Cor. xi. 20, κυριακον δειπνον is *Lord's house supper*, or

* Yet Ezek. xliv. 2—4, xlviii. 35, and Zech. xiv. 16, 17, seem to represent the earthly Jerusalem as the scene of Christ's visible glory and the centre of worship, which characteristics are ascribed to the "New Jerusalem" in the Apocalypse.

Digitized by Google

church supper, being the feast of love which the disciples were wont to partake of when they assembled together to commemorate the dying love of Him "who, though He was rich, yet for their sakes became poor, that they, through his poverty, might be rich."

I may be permitted to observe, in conclusion, that it would be greatly for the spiritual benefit of the saints were they to be much occupied on the church-day with the consideration of those sacred subjects which were, for their instruction, presented on that day to the Apostle John in spirit; and were they, on every occasion of partaking together of the church-supper, to remember that, as often as they do so, they show the Lord's death *till He come.* "He that shall come will come, and will not tarry." Happy they who, in believing the Divine testimony, the truth of the Gospel, have turned to the living and true God, to serve Him and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom He hath raised from the dead, even Jesus, who has delivered them from the coming wrath. (1 Thess. i. 10.)

I am, Sir, respectfully and faithfully yours,

Dublin, *March* 9, 1849. W. J. E.

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

SIR,—I am induced to send you a few remarks on Acts xv. 14—17, a passage which has been considered in the last number of this Journal, p. 309. I fully agree with the opinion there expressed, that the Hebrew text, Amos ix. 12, has not been corrupted; though Dr. Davidson, in his excellent work on "Sacred Hermeneutics," p. 463, expresses a contrary opinion. In his "Lectures on Biblical Criticism," p. 205, however, the learned Doctor had referred to Ps. xxii. 17, and xvi. 10, as the only two passages "in which there is the least appearance of designed corruption on the part of the Jews." Whatever might have been the origin of the Septuagint reading (the Vulgate here follows the Hebrew), its being quoted in the New Testament of course stamps it with infallibility. But we are not on that account obliged to suppose that the Hebrew has been altered. Why not simply receive *both* as equally authoritative; remembering that it is the same Spirit who spoke by the prophet and by the apostle. No apparent difficulties ought to prevent us taking the highest ground in similar cases, and reposing an implicit trust in God that He has not permitted his sacred Word to be wilfully altered at any time by any persons. Our knowledge of his character utterly forbids such a supposition. (See Matt. vii. 9—11.) But, leaving this part of the subject, it appears to me, the passage in the Acts is not affected by any view of the controverted words in question, and, moreover, that the purpose for which the apostle quoted the prophecy is not to show "that before the restoration of Israel it was God's purpose to call an 'election,' or 'remnant,' out from among the Gentiles, who, after the day of wrath, should be partakers with Israel in the blessedness of the Messiah's kingdom." (Quarterly Journal, *supra.*) The important and emphatic words of the quotation I take to be, "*Upon whom my name is called.*" The apostle proves, by citing from Amos, that God had of old declared that he intended to have a people from among *the Gentiles;* and he thus points out the agreement of the testimony of the prophets with Peter's declaration of what God had effected by him in their own times. The passage in Amos relates primarily to the millennial age; but, like many others of the same character, is applied also to the present calling of the Gentiles. (Comp. Rom. xv. 9—12.) The words אֲשֶׁר־נִקְרָא שְׁמִי עֲלֵיהֶם may be simply understood of those whom the Lord has *decreed* shall be called by his name; just as Jesus said, with reference to future Gentile converts, "And *other sheep I have*, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one flock and one shepherd." (John. x. 16.) Acts xv. 14 is rendered by Professor Scholefield,—"How God *first visited* the Gentiles," &c.; and he remarks, that it "refers to the first occasion of God's visiting the

Digitized by Google

Gentiles, not to his visiting them before the Jews." That there is nothing extraordinary or peculiar in this passage in Amos is evident from the introduction,—" to this agree the words of *the prophets.*" But the general testimony of the prophets is certainly not to the calling of some from the Gentiles "*before* the restoration of Israel," but *after*. I know of no other passages besides Deut. xxxii. 21, and Isaiah lxv. 1, quoted in Rom. x. 19, 20, that can be considered exceptions, and they clearly belong to the present dispensation.

I remain, Sir, faithfully yours,

Teignmouth, April 19, 1849. GEORGE J. WALKER.

To the Editor of the " Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—If you, or any of your readers, can remove the accompanying objections to the generally received view of the Apocalypse, I shall feel obliged.

I have most attentively studied this prophecy by itself, and have also read a good deal on all sides of the question: the result is, that whilst there are many difficulties in the Futurist interpretation, there are far more to my mind in that of Mr. Elliott.

I am, my dear Sir, yours very truly,
ARTHUR A. REES,
Minister of the Gospel.

Sunderland, May 12.

1. If the succession of Popes be the eighth head of the beast, in what sense can it be said to be " of the seven?"

2. The judgments inflicted by the two witnesses do not seem to accord with the character of this dispensation. "Father, forgive them," is rather the cry of the afflicted saints now. Yet these judgments are clearly *retaliative*, " if any man will *injure* them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth." When James and John wanted *thus* to be avenged on the Samaritans, they were rebuked for their unchristian spirit.

3. " That it rain not in the days of their prophecy." (Rev. xi.) How can this be interpreted either literally or spiritually of the 1260 days (years) of Popery? I need not speak of literal rain; but has there been no spiritual rain for 1260 years?

4. " When they shall have finished their testimony, the beast shall make war," &c. How can this be applied to the Pope? If the testimony of the witnesses *has* ceased, where are their dead bodies? If they have ascended into heaven, the beast's reign is over; but Popery still prevails.

5. The " tormenting" in xi. 10 evidently refers to the plagues in 5, 6; but this tormenting, the nations (ver. 9) *knew* to be the weapons of the slain prophets (ver. 10.) But did the Papists *know* that the judgments inflicted on them were for the sake of the Protestants they had slaughtered?

6. If the greater part of the Revelation has been fulfilled, who can be represented by the throned priests? And whose can be the prayers which they offer? How can this vision have any reference to the *present* dispensation? In heaven, we know there are no prayers in behalf of its inhabitants; so that the prayers offered by the crowned priests must be for others than themselves. For whom then?

7. The 1260 days, in chap. xii., are called a *short time*—but if they are 1260 years, the beast's reign is longer than the millennial reign of Christ; and if 1260 years be called a short time, then 1800 years are but a little longer; and so, the fulfilment of the Revelation may yet be future, in spite of its being said in the exordium that it reveals things " which must *shortly* come to pass." Moreover, if 1260 days mean 1260 years, how can we avoid interpreting the thousand years of the twentieth chapter to mean 365,000 years? Then, indeed, the 1260 years of chapter xii. would be but a short time.

Digitized by Google

8. If the scorpion-locusts mean the Saracens—how can it be said that they injured none of God's marked people? Were none of the saints killed by the Saracens? As to temporal judgments—did they not suffer as much as others? But if preservation from false doctrine be intended—how is it that the marked people are not said to be preserved from the *smoke*, instead of the scorpion stings? Moreover, it is clear, that the marked people were not to be hurt, *in the same sense* that the *grass* was not to be hurt; but the latter is said to be literal—so then the former;—but how does this agree with truth?

9. If the scorpion-locusts symbolized men, would it not be incongruous to say that their faces were like those of men? But if their human faces prefigured men, what can be meant by their lion-like teeth? If the woman-like hair prefigured, as is said, the long hair of the Saracens, then surely the lion-like teeth must prefigure the teeth of wild beasts.

10. How can it be said that the fire, smoke, and brimstone of the sixth trumpet were the three causes of the death of the third part of men, if the destruction of Constantinople by artillery be meant? What had *smoke* to do with its destruction? Moreover, these three agents proceeded out of the *horses' mouths;*—how can this symbolize cannon balls proceeding out of the cannon's mouth? The horses, too, are literally interpreted to signify Turkish cavalry,—what, then, is meant by the lion-like heads?

11. If the temple, altar, and worshippers being measured, (Rev. xi.,) means the preservation of the true worship, and the true saints in Popish times—what is meant by the *holy city* being trodden down, *because it was not measured?* Who or what does the holy city represent?

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

Sir,—As a subscriber to your valuable Journal, I cannot do less than express the great pleasure and profit I have derived from it, on subjects which, for many years, have engaged my earnest attention.

The papers on the Psalms are very important, but your correspondent thereon seems to have omitted a very striking point in Ps. i. 5, where the word rendered in our version "*stand,*" is קוּם, the primary meaning of which is, to RISE. Thus, in Hebrew the verse reads, "For this *(reason)* the ungodly shall *not rise* in the judgment, nor sinners in the assembly of the righteous." Our revered translators, not entering into the doctrine of the first resurrection, have overlooked the *primary* meaning of *rising*, and taken the secondary one of *standing;* but both the orthodox and English churchman, Parkhurst, and the German Neologian, Gesenius, give *to rise*, or *stand up*, as the first meaning of the verb in question, while *standing* is a derived meaning; as we must allow that any object must rise, or be raised up, before it can stand upright.

Thus we have, as far back as the strains of holy David, a full statement of the first resurrection, or raising of the saints *only;* and a clear distinction established between the resurrection of "him that serveth God, and him that serveth Him not." The announcement in Rev. xx. 5, "the *rest* of the dead lived not again, till the thousand years were finished," has received many explanations, (or rather *evasions,*) from the opponents of this doctrine; but the plain declaration, "the ungodly shall *not rise* in that judgment," is too clear to be explained away.

I remain, Sir, with sincere good wishes, yours, &c.,

X. Q.

Digitized by Google

THE NIGHT AND THE MORNING.

"At evening-tide trouble; before the morning he is not."—Isa. xvii. 14.

I.

To dream a troubled dream, and then awaken
  To the soft gladness of a summer-sky;
To dream ourselves alone, unloved, forsaken,
  And then to wake 'mid smiles and love and joy;—

II.

To look at evening on the storm's rude motion,
  The cloudy tumult of the fretted deep;
And then at day-burst upon that same ocean,
  Soothed to the stillness of its stillest sleep;—

III.

So runs our course,—so tells the Church her story,
  So to the end shall it be ever told;
Brief shame on earth; but after shame the glory,
  That wanes not, dims not, never waxes old.

IV.

Lord Jesus, come, and end this troubled dreaming!
  Dark shadows vanish, rosy twilight break!
Morn of the true and real, burst forth, calm-beaming,—
  Day of the beautiful, arise, awake!

NOTICE.

We have received several long communications on passages in the Apocalypse, chiefly those referring to the "Beasts." It is impossible that we can insert them all. As they contradict each other, and do not seem to us to succeed in obviating difficulties, we have laid them aside. In reviewing books we have, of course, frequent occasion to differ from the authors. This leads some to send us communications in defence of statements impugned by us. These it is out of our power to insert, save in special circumstances. We wish this to be clearly understood, as otherwise we shall be landed in a correspondence large enough to fill a volume. We have again to request correspondents to be compact and brief.

All readers of the Journal are most earnestly besought to give it room in their prayers; that by means of it God may be honoured and his truth advanced; also, that it may be conducted in faith and love, with sobriety of judgment and discernment of the truth, in nothing carried away into error, or hasty speech, or sharp unbrotherly disputation.

Macintosh, Printer, Great New-street, London.

Digitized by Google

THE QUARTERLY

JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

OCTOBER, 1849.

Art. I.—ON THE ORIGIN OF THE HARMONIZING GOSPELS.

Any careful student of the Evangelical history must have observed certain remarkable features in the harmonizing Gospels. Sometimes the same events are recorded in two, or in all three of the Gospels, but we also find matter equally important reported by only one, and omitted by another; we have even intimations of many mighty works which are mentioned by none of the three; there are indications again that our Lord's labours were extended through Judea as well as Galilee, and yet the records are chiefly confined to events that occurred in peculiar localities of Galilee. Sometimes, when in the narratives we find identity of subject, there is only equivalence of expression; but at other times we have not only "words and phrases alike, but even rare and singular expressions are identical." (*Davidson.*) Again, there seems something capricious in the use made by the Evangelists of the Old Testament,—sometimes apparently the Septuagint, sometimes the Hebrew original having been preferred.

These phenomena have been made the subject of much ingenious conjecture. There is sufficient verbal resemblance to mark some common Greek original; there is also sufficient historical independence to make it difficult to say what that common origin was. What was the rule for the selection of matter? If the Gospels were supplemental to each other, why so much repetition? If substitutionary, why so many omissions? What common original could there have been, sufficiently fluctuating to account for the variations and apparent discrepancies of independent historians, and yet so

Digitized by Google

stereotyped as to preserve the minutest verbal peculiarities? Why should the less important field of Galilee be selected in preference to Judea and its capital? And when we come to the all-absorbing events occurring at the close of our Lord's ministry at Jerusalem, why is the peculiar verbal phenomenon so much less prominent? Why in the quotations should the Messianic passages be chiefly from the Hebrew, and yet in some of our Lord's arguments, should the force of the quotation rest upon words found only in the Septuagint?

It is not my purpose to refute, or even to state, the hypotheses which have been proposed; no one theory can be very generally thought satisfactory, because up to this moment each has had equally clever and ingenious advocates. As hypotheses they all seem defective, inasmuch as that they do not attempt to account for all the phenomena. But there is one point upon which I must make a passing remark,—they are not only unsatisfactory and insufficient,—they all appear more or less derogatory to the integrity of the Evangelical histories, the effect of which, I think, is plainly seen in the very different feeling with which the Gospels are approached now, from what was the case a very few years ago.

If the hypothesis elaborated by Bishop Marsh be adopted, that from some original anonymous document, different copies have been made, to which different anonymous additions and interpolations had been annexed, and that from those the various Gospels were compiled, it will be scarcely possible to estimate their historical value very highly.

The theory of an oral traditional original is perhaps somewhat better, for its origin is admitted to be apostolic, but if it be supposed to account for the verbal resemblance, I cannot conceive how the traditional Gospel could have been stereotyped in the reciter's memories, first in Aramaic, and then in Greek, as long as there were any eye or ear-witnesses of the events described still alive, for their reminiscences would have constantly disturbed the monotonous uniformity. Could the relaters of the oral Gospel have so constantly reiterated, as to produce great verbal similarity, such a passage as, "Woe unto thee, Chorazin," &c., without any one of the many mighty works which had been done in Chorazin ever having been brought to mind? But if we suppose so late a date for the composition of the Gospels as this theory would necessitate, I fear we should go far towards admitting their mythical origin.

If, according to the supplemental theory, one Evangelist wrote with a previous Gospel before him, there would be

Digitized by Google

apparently either collusion or contradiction; in fact, we avoid the suspicion of collusion, by admitting the charge of apparent contradiction; but if one Gospel was written with cognisance of another, then the contradictions become more than apparent, they amount to corrections, they are no longer the discrepancies incident to independent authorities, the succeeding Evangelist stamps the narrative of his predecessor with error. Hug, by no means an irreverent writer, while he maintains that Mark wrote with Matthew's Gospel before him, does not disguise the result to which this hypothesis leads: Mark "is not, as some have repeated from Augustine, the epitomist, but the reviser of Matthew; and sometimes his revision is so rigid, that he seems positively to contradict him." (*Hug*, part ii. ch. i. § 27.) Hug then gives instances which differ in their aspects; precisely according to the manner in which we view them, they are the differences of independent authors, or the corrections of Matthew by Mark. He says they are, "what indeed would be real contradictions, did we not know that Matthew was indifferent as to things not connected with his purpose." But if Mark corrects Matthew, Matthew's indifference does not prevent their being real contradictions, for the instances cited are not of omissions, but, according to this theory, of over-statements; instead of two demoniacs, Mark corrects Matthew, and says there was but one; instead of two blind men, Mark corrects Matthew, and says there was but one. Whereas, according to the commonly admitted rule, viewing both as independent witnesses, the mention of but one blind man or one demoniac by one of the historians, does not invalidate the testimony of the eye-witness to the effect that there were two.

Again, if Luke wrote having cognisance of Matthew's and Mark's Gospels, then they must be amongst the many which he intended to supersede; and if he desired to record all that Jesus did and taught, in order that Theophilus might know the certainty of them, he seems to render doubtful the authority of those portions of Matthew which he does not repeat.*

There is, lastly, one other objection common to the practical result of all these theories. We cannot make use of the very strongest internal evidence for the authenticity of the Gospels, viz., that springing from the undesigned

* The effect of the different theories upon the construction of a harmony is evident. Thus Mr. Greswell, who supposes that Mark wrote after and with express relation to Matthew, and Luke, in like manner, subsequently and in direct accommodation to both Matthew and Mark, makes the order of Matthew in every instance give place to that of Luke.

Digitized by Google

coincidences of independent witnesses; because the coincidences are not undesigned, the witnesses are not independent.

I will first enter a little more into detail with regard to the peculiar features of the synoptical Gospels, and then suggest a thought springing from the previous inquiries of others, which I think will give a solution, not of some few, but of all the phenomena noticed above, which, therefore, as an hypothesis, will have claims superior to those hitherto propounded, but which has the still greater recommendation of elucidating most satisfactorily the authenticity and inspiration of the Gospels.

The three first Gospels have not the character of continuous histories, but are rather composed of brief sections, forming a series of short narratives, complete in themselves, and very commonly quite independent of what precedes and follows.

There are plain intimations in the Gospels of many events having occurred of which not one Evangelist gives any account. There is, for example, no record of our Lord ever having been at Chorazin, or at Bethsaida either, until after the woe was denounced, though most of his mighty works were done in those places. Yet, at the same time, there is a very constant repetition of some other events, sometimes by all three, sometimes by two of the Evangelists. Mark has many additional circumstances, but only twenty-four verses narrate facts not contained either in Matthew or Luke. Matthew records sixteen miracles, Luke fifteen, but eleven are repetitions of Matthew; Mark records fifteen also, but twelve are repetitions of Matthew and ten of Luke.

Again, without taking the Gospel of John into account, we may gather from the first three Gospels, that the Evangelists were aware of considerable part of our Lord's ministry having been passed in Judea, and yet they chiefly confine their records to events occurring in Galilee.

We learn from Matt. iv. 12, and Mark i. 14, that Jesus remained in Judea after his baptism until John was imprisoned,—a period of about six months. The effect of his ministry seems apparent, in multitudes following him from Jerusalem and Judea. (Matt. iv. 25.) The other Evangelists record a similar following, on another occasion of withdrawal. (Mark iii. 8; Luke vii. 9.) The faith of the centurion (Matt. viii. 10; Luke vii. 9) is compared with what Jesus had met in Israel; this "no, not in Israel," cannot be limited to the people of Israel in Galilee, as contrasted with others that our Lord had also met there, but

Digitized by Google

"Israel" seems to be put in opposition to "Galilee of the Gentiles." Neander takes an intimation from Matt. xvi. 1, "in which the Scribes and Pharisees of *Jerusalem* are spoken of as gathering round Jesus in *Galilee*, and asking him entangling questions. . . . . After his labours in Jerusalem had drawn their hatred upon him, they followed him, and watched him suspiciously, even in Galilee." (*Neander's "Life of Christ,"* p. 157.) The same may be noticed upon another occasion. (Luke v. 17.) Had our Lord been supposed to have confined his ministry to Galilee, the historians would hardly have recorded his declaration, that he was only sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. xv. 24), or that his apostles were to confine their labours to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, to the exclusion of the cities of the Samaritans and Gentiles (Matt. x. 6), for the inconsistency would have been manifest. "Again, the earnest exclamation of Christ recorded in Luke xiii. 34, Matt. xxiii. 37, distinctly implies that he had *often* endeavoured *by his personal teaching in Jerusalem*, to rouse the people to repentance and conversion, that they might be saved." (*Neander*, p. 157.) Luke xix. 41, 42, is a similar example: "If thou hadst known . . . . but now are they hid from thine eyes," implies former warnings and strivings unheeded, and the consequent judicial blindness which then was supervening.

There are, I think, other intimations of our Lord having been in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. The parable of the two who "went up to the temple to pray" (Luke xviii. 10) implies that locality. So, also, Luke xiii. 1, "There were present at that season some that told him of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices;" this must have been where the sacrifices were offered. The allusion to the two sparrows (Matt. x. 29), probably also intimates the vicinity of the temple, the sparrows being used by the leper for purification. (Lev. xiv. 4—9.)

With regard to the verbal particularities, the author of the "Introduction to the English Translation of Schleiermacher on Luke" says,—"One phenomenon which struck Mr. Veysie, ... which cannot safely be neglected on any hypothesis, and which seems more likely than any other to lend a clue in the most difficult parts of the subject, is that the verbal agreement of the Evangelists is found chiefly in the words of our Lord, or of others, and comparatively seldom in the

narrative of facts." (*Introduction to Schleiermacher on Luke*, p. xxxvi.)

"In Matthew's Gospel, the passages verbally coincident with one or both of the other Gospels, amount to less than one-sixth part of the contents, and of this about seven-eighths occur in the recital of the words of others. In Mark's Gospel, the proportion of coincident passages is about one-sixth, of which not one-fifth occurs in narrative. In Luke, the proportion of verbal agreement is one-tenth, of which one-twentieth is in narrative."* (*Norton*, vol. i., note D, p. cl.) Now, the proportion of resemblance between the narrative and the relation of the words of others being so different, "the same cause could not have operated alone in both these different portions, to produce coincidence of language." (*Ibid.*, p. cii.)

"For the comparison of *verbal correspondence* in three Gospels, the following passages . . . . may serve:—

Matt. iii. 3, 11.	Mark i. 3, 7.	Luke iii. 4, 16.
„ viii. 2, 3, 4.	„ i. 40, 41, 42, 44.	„ v. 12, 13, 14.
„ viii. 15.	„ i. 31.	„ iv. 39.
„ ix. 2, 4, 5, 6.	„ ii. 5, 8, 9, 10.	„ v. 20, 22, 23, 24.
„ ix. 15.	„ ii. 20.	„ v. 35.
„ ix. 22, 24.	„ v. 34, 39.	„ viii. 48, 52.
„ xii. 13.	„ iii. 5.	„ vi. 10.
„ xiv. 19, 20.	„ vi. 41, 42, 43.	„ ix. 16, 17.
„ xvi. 21, 24, 25, 26.	„ viii. 34, 35, 36, 37.	„ ix. 23, 24, 25.
„ xvi. 28; xvii. 5.	„ ix. 1, 7.	„ ix. 27, 35.
„ xvii. 17.	„ ix. 19.	„ ix. 41.
„ xix. 29.	„ x. 29.	„ xviii. 29.
„ xxi. 12, 13, 23, 25, 26, 27.	„ xi. 15, 17, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33.	„ xix. 45, 46; xx. 2, 4, 5, 6, 8.
„ xxi. 42.	„ xii. 10.	„ xx. 17.
„ xxii. 44.	„ xii. 36.	„ xx. 42, 43.
„ xxiv. 6—9, 19, 30, 35.	„ xiii. 7—13, 17, 26, 31.	„ xxi. 9—17, 23, 27, 33.
„ xxvi. 29.	„ xiv. 25.	„ xxii. 18.

"Specimens of verbal correspondence in sections, common to only two of the Evangelists:—

Matt. xiv. 22, 34.	Mark vi. 45, 53.
„ xv. 7, 8, 9, 10.	„ vii. 6, 7, 14.
„ xv. 26, 32.	„ vii. 27; viii. 1, 2.
„ xix. 5, 6.	„ x. 7, 8, 9.
„ xx. 22—28.	„ x. 38—45.
„ xxiv. 22.	„ xiii. 20.
Mark i. 24, 25.	Luke iv. 34, 35.
„ viii. 38.	„ ix. 26.

* The verbal coincidence between Mark and Luke amounts, in all, to less than one-twelfth part of Mark's Gospel.

Digitized by Google

Mark ix. 38, 40.	Luke ix. 49, 50.
Matt. v. 44; vii. 5.	„ vi. 27, 28, 42.
„ viii. 8, 9, 10.	„ vii. 6—9.
„ viii. 20, 22.	„ ix. 58, 60.
„ xi. 3—11, 16—19.	„ vii. 19—28, 31—35.
„ xii. 41—45.	„ xi. 32, 31, 24, 25, 26.
„ xiii. 33.	„ xiii. 20, 21.
„ xxiii. 37, 38.	„ xiii. 34, 35.
„ xxiv. 46, 47, 48, 50.	„ xii. 43, 44, 45, 46."

(*Davidson's Introduction*, p. 378.)

The quotations from the Old Testament in the Gospels compose so integral and important an element, that no theory intended to account for the origin of the Gospels can be pronounced satisfactory which leaves their phenomena unexplained. But here, as the distinction has been drawn between the verbal resemblance in the narrative and in the conversations, so a similar distinction must be observed between the quotations of our Lord recorded by the Evangelists and the prophecies cited by them as fulfilled by occurrences in our Lord's history. I, therefore, subjoin a list of quotations from the Old Testament, found in the first three Gospels, taken from "Horne's Introduction," but separated according to the above-named distinction:—

Quotations by our Lord from the Old Testament.

Matt. iv. 4; Luke iv. 4.	Verbatim with the Septuagint.
„ iv. 6. [By Satan.]	Taken from the Septuagint.
„ iv. 7.	Verbatim with the Septuagint.
„ iv. 10.	Taken from the Septuagint.
„ ix. 13;* xii. 7.	Verbatim with the Septuagint.
„ xi. 10; Mark i. 2; Luke vii. 27.	Differs from both Hebrew and Septuagint.
„ xiii. 14, 15; Mark iv. 12; Luke viii. 10.	Taken from the Septuagint.
„ xv. 8, 9.	Differs from the Hebrew, agrees with the Septuagint.
„ xix. 5.	Taken from the Septuagint.
„ xix. 18, 19.	Verbatim with the Septuagint.
„ xix. 19; xxii. 39.	Verbatim with the Septuagint.
„ xxi. 13; Mark xi. 17; Luke xix. 46.	Agrees both with Hebrew and Septuagint. Bloomfield on Mark; Govett on Isaiah lvi. 7. Not mentioned by Horne.
„ xxi. 16.	Verbatim with the Septuagint.
„ xxi. 42; Mark xii. 10; Luke xx. 17.	Verbatim with the Septuagint.
„ xxii. 32; Mark xii. 26; Luke xx. 37.	Verbatim with the Septuagint.

* But Moses Stewart says this is a direct translation from the Hebrew

Digitized by Google

Matt. xxii. 37; Mark xii. 30; Luke x. 27.	Agrees with the Septuagint in sense, not in words; nearly agrees with the Hebrew.
„ xxii. 44; Mark xii. 36; Luke xx. 42. . . .	Verbatim with the Septuagint.
„ xxvi. 31.	Verbatim with the Septuagint.
„ xxvii. 46. [In Hebrew.] .	Differs from the Septuagint; agrees with the Hebrew.
Luke iv. 18, 19.	Taken from the Septuagint.
„ xxii. 37.	Agrees in sense, not in words, with the Septuagint. Exact with the Hebrew.

Here it will be observed that our Lord's quotations almost universally agree with the Septuagint,* some of which, at the same time, differ from the Hebrew. The next list is of citations by the Evangelists, of prophecies as fulfilled by circumstances in our Lord's life and ministry.

Citations by the harmonizing Evangelists:—

Matt. i. 23.	Nearly agrees with the Hebrew. Taken from the Septuagint.
„ ii. 6.	Rendered from the Hebrew. (Moses Stewart.) Horne says that this differs from the Hebrew as well as the Septuagint. I have followed the authority of Moses Stewart.
„ ii. 15.	Differs from the Septuagint, exact with the Hebrew.
„ ii. 18.	Differs from the Septuagint, rendered from the Hebrew. (Moses Stewart.)
„ ii. 23.	Not quoted from any particular prophet.
„ iii. 3; Mark i. 3; Luke iii. 4—6.	Agrees in sense, though not exactly with the Hebrew, and also with the Septuagint, probably so rendered by the sacred writers themselves.
„ vi. 15, 16.	Differs from the Septuagint, rendered from the Hebrew. (Stewart.)
„ viii. 17.	Differs from the Septuagint, rendered from the Hebrew. (Stewart.)
„ xii. 18—21.	Differs from the Septuagint, rendered from the Hebrew. (Stewart.)
„ xiii. 35.	Agrees in sense, not in words, with the Septuagint; rendered from the Heb. (Stewart.)
„ xxi. 5.	Differs from the Septuagint, rendered from the Hebrew. (Stewart.)
„ xxvii. 9, 10.	Varies from the Septuagint, rendered from the Hebrew. (Stewart.)
„ xxvii. 35.	Verbatim with the Septuagint, exact with the Hebrew.

* There are four exceptions,—Matt. xi. 10; xxii. 37; xxvii. 46; Luke xxii. 37; which shall be noticed after the theory has been propounded.

Digitized by Google

Mark xv. 28.	Agrees in sense, not in words, with the Septuagint, exact with the Hebrew.
Luke ii. 23.	Agrees in sense, not in words, with the Septuagint, exact with the Hebrew.
„ ii. 24.	Agrees in sense, not in words, with the Septuagint, exact with the Heb.

Here it will be perceived that the general rule is precisely the reverse of what prevailed in the former class of quotations. Those made by the Evangelists themselves, and not their records of quotations occurring in conversations, are, with scarcely one exception, exact renderings from the Hebrew. In no instance is the authority of the Septuagint preferred to that of the Hebrew; on the contrary, whenever they differ the Hebrew is followed.

Now here we get two distinct sets of appearances, and both plainly pointing to one solution. The peculiar verbal resemblance between the Evangelists, preserved in the Greek, is chiefly in the conversations of our Lord and others, not in the narrative. In like manner, the quotations used by our Lord in conversation, verbally agree with the Septuagint, while the quotations by the evangelical historians themselves equally mark that they preferred the authority of the Hebrew, thereby showing that it is for some other reason, and not from any supposed superior authority, that the Septuagint is quoted.

Before, however, stating the hypothesis which I propose, I will give the result of a very interesting inquiry of Hug's as to the language of Palestine at the time of our Lord's ministry:—"The Syrian, Phœnician, and Jewish coast throughout, to the borders of Egypt, was occupied by cities either entirely or half Greek. The Israelitish east, from the Arnon upwards, Gilead, Bashan, Hauran, Trachonitis, including Abilene, was entirely Greek towards the north, and towards the south mostly in possession of the Greeks. In Judea and Galilee there were several cities wholly, or at least in great measure, inhabited by Greeks." (*Hug's Introduction*, part ii., ch. i., § 10, p. 339. Fosbrook's Ed.)

That Hug's conclusion is correct seems to be generally admitted. The author of the Introduction to Schleiermacher's "Essay on Luke" says, "The result of the inquiry seems to be, that in the time of Christ several towns of Palestine were exclusively inhabited by Greeks; that Greek was the medium of intercourse between the Romans and the Jews; that the knowledge of it was very general in the cities and amongst the more educated classes; and that on the whole the number of those who knew no other language was greater than that

Digitized by Google

of those who understood only the vernacular tongue of Palestine." (*Introduction*, p. ci.)

Moses Stewart says, "Hug has shewn amply, and I should think conclusively, that Greek was very extensively spoken in Palestine during the apostolic ages." (Note 15, p. 705. Fosbrook.)

Our Lord was induced at various times to leave Judea and to pursue his ministry in Galilee, not from want of success, but, apparently, from prudential motives. When he learned that John had been cast into prison, and that the Pharisees were aware of his still greater success (Matt. iv. 12, with John iv. 1), expecting that their undivided opposition would thenceforth be directed against him, he departed from Judea and fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, by pursuing his ministry in "Galilee of the Gentiles." When he again attempted Judea, the persecution of the Pharisees caused him a second time to retire to the sea (Mark iii. 6, 7); and thus another prophecy with regard to our Lord was fulfilled in two respects, first, his desire to avoid strife (Matt. xii. 19), which caused him to retire from the Pharisees; and next, his successful efforts among the Gentiles. "He shall shew judgment unto the Gentiles . . . . . and in his name shall the Gentiles trust." (Matt. xii. 18—21.) John states the same reason upon two other occasions (John vii. 1; xi. 54), as explaining why our Lord walked in Galilee in preference to Judea. Where the Gentile element was strong, there the persecuting propensity of the Pharisees was not so powerful; and, as our Lord was forced to pursue his ministry where Jewish prejudice had been partly broken down by the Gentile intermixture, it is clear that many of his labours and discourses must have been where the Greek language and not the Aramaic prevailed.

The theory then which I propose is simply this:—In those parts where Greek was the more prevalent language, or when addressing a mixed multitude among whom the Greek was the most generally familiar language, our Lord's discourses were in that language; that the apostles being scrupulously faithful, and intending to write their histories in the language which obtained throughout the world, preferred recording those events, and relating those discourses in which the very words of our Lord, and not mere translations, could be preserved: that therefore we must in this manner account for the verbal resemblance in the discourses of our Lord, as also for his having used the Septuagint Version in his quotations. This idea accounts for by far the greater portion of verbal identity in the Gospels; but, as Norton justly

Digitized by Google

observes (vol. i. p. cii.) another cause must have been in operation to produce coincidence of language, where the Evangelists spoke in their own persons. This I will attempt to point out hereafter in each individual case.

This theory also accounts for the law which regulated the Evangelists in their quotations from the Old Testament. When using their Scriptures as an authority, they preferred the original Hebrew; but, as I have already noticed, when recording our Lord's arguments, the Septuagint is followed. This is perfectly intelligible if the conversations in which these quotations are found were carried on in Greek; but, had our Lord discoursed in Aramaic, and quoted from the Hebrew, it is inconceivable that the Evangelists would have followed the Septuagint version in recording his quotations, whilst they themselves preferred using the Hebrew as an authority.

The theory also accounts for the peculiar character of the Greek. Luke by his introduction shows himself by no means incapable of writing good Greek, yet his Gospel, and the first part of the Acts, as well as the other two harmonizing Gospels, "next to the Apocalypse, are the most thoroughly Hebraic of any part of the Scriptures." (*Newman in Kitto, article "Hellenists."*) Now it is pretty evident that even in those parts of Galilee where Greek was the more prevalent language, it would not be in a pure form, but would have a strong Aramaic intermixture, which the Evangelists, if they were not translating, but recording what actually occurred, would preserve. In the latter part of the Acts, when Luke was not influenced by this cause, he gives us purer Greek.

The same reason will explain why the verbal resemblance is not discernible in the record of conversations connected with the crucifixion. The language of our Lord's most prejudiced opponents in Jerusalem was not Greek.

The same reason which influenced the Evangelists in the choice of their subjects will account for the events of Galilee being almost exclusively recorded.*

The resemblance between any two, together with their difference from the third Evangelist, either in the incidents or in the historic order of the events, may, I apprehend, be accounted for by our tracing the personal history of the Evangelists. Luke and Mark being sometimes together witnesses of apostolic discourses, where Matthew was absent; Mark again, being with Matthew when Luke was absent, and

* The reason why events in particular localities of Galilee are not recorded will subsequently be noticed.

Digitized by Google

Luke possibly during his two years' residence in Judea, deriving his information partly from Matthew, or the hearers of Matthew, when Mark was elsewhere.

I have now stated the theory and shewn how as an hypothesis it accounts for all the phenomena, except one minor point, which I have reserved for future examination; and I maintain that, as an hypothesis, it is superior to any one hitherto proposed, inasmuch as it solves all the phenomena, and does so in a probable and simple manner, instead of only accounting for one particular feature, by many improbable and gratuitous assumptions.

I now propose making some observations on the different sections in which the verbal resemblance is discernible; but, as Bishop Marsh's observations were made with reference to the theory which he propounded, it will, perhaps, be safer to follow Dr. Davidson in the examples which he has given as quoted above, without however losing sight of the learned Prelate, particularly with respect to the passages where the verbal resemblance ceases, which did not fall within the province of Dr. Davidson to notice.

In the mission of the Baptist (Matt. iii. 1—12; Mark i. 2—8; Luke iii. 1—18) there appears considerable verbal resemblance. In the 3d verses of Matthew and Mark, and the 4th of Luke, all differ in the quotation, both from the Hebrew and the Septuagint, and all agree in the deviation. The verbal resemblance with each other, where they at the same time differ from the Septuagint, shows that all could not have derived the quotation immediately from the Septuagint, there must have been some common source for the quotation in its present form. Mr. Horne says, "It agrees in sense though not exactly with the Hebrew, and also with the Septuagint, probably it was so rendered by the sacred writers themselves;" but the verbal resemblance in like manner prevents our supposing that it was so rendered *independently* by each of the sacred writers. Mr. Huxtable in his learned essay having discussed the matter at some length, infers that the quotation was derived from the Septuagint, but that it was a quotation from memory. Now it will also be observed that the resemblance in the 6th verse of this passage of Matthew with the 5th of Mark is in the narrative, which leads to the conclusion that whatever verbal resemblance there may be between any two of the three Evangelists in this passage, it cannot be accounted for solely by the supposition that the language was originally Greek; it comes under the second class of phenomena which I noticed, viz., the verbal resemblance where the Evangelists spoke in

Digitized by Google

their own persons. Here then we must admit that the Evangelists derived their information from the same source, and that that source was not the immediate fountain-head. But that it was not either a written document or a *stereotyped* oral original appears probable from the clauses in Matthew v. 11 and Luke v. 16 not being in the same order as in Mark v. 7. The sacred writers must have been ear-witnesses of Peter, or Andrew, or some other of John's disciples, and the quotation from the Old Testament having been from memory leads to the same conclusion.

In the healing of the leper (Matt. viii. 1—4; Mark i. 40—45; Luke v. 12—16) the verbal agreement is in the conversation and not in the additional narrative by Mark and Luke. This passage, therefore, is a fair test of the theory with regard to the first and principal class of verbal phenomena, viz., the verbal resemblance in our Lord's discourses.

Now as we learn from St. Luke that the leper was *in* one of the cities, it must have been a city where Gentile influence predominated; for it was contrary to the law that a leper should be in one of the cities of Israel. (Lev. xiii. 46.) Our Lord moreover appears to allude to this very leper in his visit to Nazareth (Luke iv. 27); and as he justifies the extension of mercy to him by a similar benefit formerly conferred on a Gentile leper, we may infer that, not only was the city one in which Gentile influence predominated, but that the individual was himself a Gentile. I do not doubt, therefore, that the verbal resemblance in this passage is to be traced to the original discourse having been in Greek.

Matt. viii. 14—17; Mark i. 30—34; Luke iv. 38—41.

Bishop Marsh finds no verbal agreement between Matthew and Mark in this passage. When Peter and his brother fishermen were first called, the vernacular language among them does not appear to have been Greek, the terms Messias,* Cephas (John i. 41, 42), seem to intimate the contrary; hence, we could not account for any verbal agreement in this passage proceeding from that source. The resemblance pointed out by Dr. Davidson between the fifteenth verse of Matthew and its parallels is not in conversation, but narrative; and as Matthew was not an ear-witness any more than the others, the resemblance is to be attributed

* But in Samaria we gather from the woman saying, "Messias, . . . which is called Christ;" that though she styled him Messias, in accordance with the usage of the Jews (as she was addressing one), yet that amongst her people, "Christ" was the more general designation.

Digitized by Google

to the same source of information, probably Peter himself. The quotation in Matthew differing from the Septuagint, but being, according to Moses Stewart, rendered from the Hebrew, is a negative confirmation of the theory proposed.

Matt. ix. 1—8; Mark ii. 1—12; Luke v. 17—26.

The miracle recorded in this section was performed in Capernaum, one of the cities against which the Lord subsequently denounced the woe. And here I must point out a difference which appears in the contrast drawn by our Lord between Capernaum with Sodom, and that between Chorazin and Bethsaida with Tyre and Sidon. These two last were Gentile cities; but the greater fitness to receive the Lord among the Gentiles was not a better moral preparation, but the absence of Jewish prejudice; the contrast, therefore, leads us to infer, that in Chorazin and Bethsaida the Jewish element predominated, and this, according to the theory proposed, accounts for none of the many mighty works which were performed there having been recorded, the Aramaic having been the language which prevailed in those cities.* But with regard to Capernaum the case is different: much of what occurred there is recorded; and our Lord, when denouncing the woe, does not compare it with any Jewish or Gentile city then in existence, but with one which had been destroyed because of its moral pollution, implying that the hinderance to his doctrine was not Jewish prejudice, but Gentile dissoluteness. That the Gentile element predominated in Capernaum is, I think, to be gathered from our Lord's address at Nazareth, "Whatsoever we have heard done in Capernaum, do also here." But he justifies his conduct by the example of Elijah, who was not sent to a woman of Israel, but to a Gentile at Sarepta of Sidon; and again, Elisha did not cure a leper in Israel, but Naaman the Syrian. (Luke iv. 16—30.) As then the Gentile element predominated at Capernaum, so also the Greek language prevailed there. We have, therefore, reason to expect verbal resemblance between the Evangelists when recording our Lord's discourses at Capernaum. And so we find it in this passage; all the verbal resemblance is in our Lord's discourse; it is not traceable in

* It was the solution of this particularity in the Gospel history which, I stated above, I had reserved for future examination. The miracle at Bethsaida, recorded by Mark, must not be included in the many mighty works, for it was performed after the woe had been denounced. I have little doubt that Bethsaida of Galilee, "the city of Andrew and Peter," was the denounced place; and we have already seen, from John i. 41, 42, that Aramaic was the language which prevailed there.

Digitized by Google

that which the Scribes said among themselves, some of whom came from Judea, and therefore, not only from prejudice, but from habit, preferred the Aramaic. And when we come to the narrative, the independent sources of information are evident, all three, for example, employing different words for "that whereon [the paralytic] lay."

Matt. ix. 9—17; Mark ii. 13—22; Luke v. 27—39.

This section relates to the call of Matthew, and the feast in his house. Bishop Marsh finds considerable verbal resemblance in this passage, particularly between the fifteenth verse of Matthew and its parallels, which is quite in accordance with the theory proposed. Probably some of the publicans in Judea were actually Gentiles. From our Lord's expression regarding Zaccheus, "He also is a son of Abraham," I should infer that it was not usual for a son of Abraham to be "a chief among the publicans." But whatever they were by birth, from the nature of their calling, all must have been familiar with the Greek language, and, in consequence of the hatred of the Jews, they must have associated much either with the Gentile population or with those who were living without the pale of the Jewish Church. Hence, we sometimes find them classed with the "Heathen," or Gentiles, and sometimes with "sinners." Perhaps the latter term does not imply distinctly that they were "sinners of the Gentiles," though Mr. Burg says, on Matt. ix. 10:—"*Sinners.* This word, in this special use of it, probably denotes Gentiles here, as in the following places, ch. xxvi. 45 (compared with ch. xx. 19); Luke vi. 32; xxiv. 7; Gal. ii. 15." And with regard to the females who were styled "sinners," one might expect that many of them would be Gentiles, as "it seems probable that some of the later Jews interpreted the prohibition against fornication (Deut. xxii. 41) as limited to females of their own nation." And this, I think, accounts satisfactorily for our Lord's declaration, that the publicans and harlots were more ready than the Scribes to enter the kingdom of God; their greater fitness did not proceed from their greater moral delinquency, but from their not having the strong Jewish prejudice of the Scribes and Pharisees.

From the whole I should conclude, that generally we might expect to find in our Lord's addresses to the publicans and sinners such verbal resemblance in the Gospels as would indicate that Greek was the language in which the discourse was carried on. With regard to the passage in hand, we have a farther confirmation in the quotation by our Lord, Matt. ix. 13, agreeing verbatim with the Septuagint.

Digitized by Google

Matt. ix. 18—26; Mark v. 22—43; Luke viii. 41—56.

Bishop Marsh discovered no verbal resemblance in this section, but Dr. Davidson does trace some in the twenty-second and twenty-fourth verses of Matthew with their parallels; however, they agree in finding no verbal resemblance in the records of the intercourse between our Lord and the ruler of the Synagogue, this is what our hypothesis would have led us to expect, the ruler of the Synagogue did not address our Lord in Greek, but in Aramaic, and this is confirmed by the very words in which our Lord addressed the damsel, "Talitha, cumi."*

The woman who had the issue of blood seems not to have been under the restraint of the Mosaic law of separation, for had the Jewish feeling been powerful, she would not have touched our Lord. (Lev. xv. 19, 25.) If he addressed her in Greek, a verbal resemblance, such as that in the twenty-second verse of Matthew with the thirty-fourth of Mark and forty-eighth of Luke, would be naturally looked for. So with regard to the similarity in the twenty-fourth verse of Matthew, with its parallels; I conceive the multitudes who had gathered from the town of Capernaum were addressed in Greek.

Matt. xii. 9—21; Mark iii. 1—12; Luke vi. 6—11.

The Gospels do not record the exact locality of this transaction. Mr. Greswell (*Harmony*, vol. ii., p. 319, 2d Edit.) argues, I think correctly, that our Lord had returned from the neighbourhood of Jerusalem after the Passover, and was now either in or near Capernaum; and, in accordance with the distinction that verbal resemblance in narrative must be traced to one common historical authority, but that verbal resemblance in the records of conversation is to be traced to the original discourses, the resemblance in this instance being in our Lord's words,† I infer that the conversation was in Greek.

* Mark upon one other occasion uses an Aramaic word, upon which, as the history (Mark vii. 31—37) has no parallel in the other Gospels, we cannot argue with regard to verbal peculiarity; nor is the exact place where the miracle was wrought mentioned. Mr. Greswell supposes it was Bethsaida; that it was in that neighbourhood is apparent from the history, and in features it much resembles the one which, it is recorded, was performed there. His taking the sufferer aside from the multitude before working the cure, and his subsequently charging those few who were witnesses to tell no man, imply that it was a denounced place. If it was Bethsaida, or Chorazin, which is perhaps as probable, it would accord with the theory that Aramaic would be spoken.

† This is the case in the fourth verse of Mark with the ninth of Luke, as well as in the thirteenth of Matthew with its parallels, Mark, verse 5, and Luke, verse 10.

Digitized by Google

Matt. xiv. 13—21; Mark vi. 31—44; Luke ix. 10—17.

The verbal resemblance in this section occurs in the narrative, Matt., vers. 19, 20; Mark, vers. 41, 42, 43; Luke, vers. 16, 17. We must, therefore, trace it to the same historical authority, which might have been Matthew himself, or any other of the apostles, for they all were present.*

Matt. xvi. 13—28; Mark viii. 27—ix. 1; Luke ix. 18—27.

I observed above that probably the vernacular language of Peter was Aramaic; but if, as I have attempted to show, many of our Lord's discourses in Galilee were in the Greek language, his immediate followers would gradually become familiarized with that language; and as "the Greek language, even during the life of Christ, was daily spreading in Palestine" (*Davidson*, p. 73), it would be quite in accordance with the wisdom of Jesus—who even in his miracles inculcated frugality in preserving that which Divine munificence had provided (John vi. 12), and who commanded the use of means to strengthen the life which Divine power had restored—not to be prodigal in conferring supernaturally that which could be acquired by ordinary means. We might expect, therefore, that before the mission of the twelve they would, by the use of the Greek in their ordinary intercourse, be thus qualified for the more efficient exercise of their office. And may there not be an intimation to this effect in the Evangelists, when, informing us of the mission, saying that Simon was sent forth with the surname of Peter, conferred by our Lord himself? (Mark iii. 16; Luke vi. 14.) Hence, we may expect that, in the latter part of our Lord's ministry, the intercourse between him and his disciples would be carried on in the Greek language.

Before examining this section I must, therefore, make a short digression in order to show that our Lord was transfigured at the time of the Feast of Tabernacles, six months before the Crucifixion, and consequently after his ministry had continued for full three years.

After the history of the Transfiguration, the next note of time which we have in Matthew is the demand for tribute at Capernaum. (Matt. xvii. 24.) This must have been in the middle of the month Adar, or only one month before the Crucifixion. (See "*The Times of Daniel*," by the Duke of

* The two Bethsaidas,—that of Gaulonitis, where the miracle was performed (Luke ix. 10), and Bethsaida of Galilee, to which our Lord retreated (Mark vi. 45),—are both mentioned in this section. It is observable that this is the only section until the close where all the four Gospels harmonize. (Compare John vi. 1—13.)

Digitized by Google

Manchester, p. 374.) There is, therefore, no reason why the Transfiguration should not have been as late as the Feast of Tabernacles, and I think there are several positive reasons for its having been at that time, viz., the coincidence in doctrinal development, the manifest allusion to tabernacles, a striking coincidence between John and Mark, the harmonies of time and place in the progress towards Jerusalem, and lastly, the motive which our Lord had in manifesting forth his glory.

Our Lord having so highly commended Peter for his enlightened testimony, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," makes it evident that this was the first explicit declaration on the part of the apostles to that effect. It cannot be supposed that Peter had already spontaneously made this confession without any peculiar notice of it having been taken by the Messiah. I therefore conclude, that the declaration in John vi. 69, "We believe and are sure that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," was after Matt. xvi. 13, &c., and being a repetition of the testimony already given, it probably was but shortly after; I therefore date John vi. 66—vii. 1, at some time during the week which elapsed between the confession and the Transfiguration.

We next learn, that the Feast of Tabernacles was at hand. It was time for those who intended to attend to start from Galilee; our Lord, however, told his brethren, "I go not up yet to the feast." (John vii. 2—9.)

The Transfiguration was on the eighth day, inclusive, from the time of Peter's confession; and if Tabor was "the holy mount," our Lord had been drawing towards Jerusalem; and Peter, in accordance with nothing that is recorded in the synoptical Gospels, but corresponding precisely with what our Lord had told his brethren, as reported by John, proposed to make tabernacles there, saying, "Master, it is good for us to be here. You are drawing towards Jerusalem, where the Jews of late sought to kill thee (John vii. 1); rather let us 'stay here' to keep the feast."

After "his brethren were gone up, then went [Jesus] also up to the feast, not openly, but *as it were in secret*" (John vii. 10), which appears to correspond remarkably with Mark ix. 30, "And they departed thence, and passed through Galilee; and *he would not that any man should know it*."

Our Lord appeared at Jerusalem about the midst of the feast (John vii. 14), corresponding precisely as to time, upon the supposition that he was upon the holy mount on the night previous to the first day of the feast.

Lastly, John acknowledges, or alludes to, the Jewish

Digitized by Google

tradition that Messiah would appear at the Feast of Tabernacles. (See the chapter on the Transfiguration in "*The Finished Mystery*," by the Duke of Manchester.) That which his unbelieving brethren tauntingly demanded, but without avail, our Lord did vouchsafe to his confessing disciples,—the vision of "the Son of man coming in his kingdom," and at the very season at which it was traditionally expected. Here I close what, I fear, may be considered rather a long digression, but having, I trust, succeeded in proving that the Transfiguration was at the Feast of Tabernacles, six months before the Crucifixion.

And now to turn to the passage in hand. When our Lord said, "Thou art Peter (that name which he himself had already conferred), and upon this *Rock* I will build my Church"* (Matt. xvi. 18), he must have been talking Greek. The remarkable verbal resemblance that there is throughout the conversation in this section I, therefore, attribute unhesitatingly to the discourse having been originally in Greek.

Matt. xvii. 1—13; Mark ix. 2—13; Luke ix. 28—36.

The matter of this section must have been derived from one or other of the three who witnessed the vision. I suppose that both Matthew and Mark derived their information from Peter, which will account, in part at least, for the resemblance between those two pointed out by Bishop Marsh (Matt. xvii. 1, 2, 4, with Mark ix. 2 and 5); but the verbal resemblance in this part being wanting in Luke, I should suppose that he derived his information from one of the other witnesses, and if so, the verbal resemblance in his thirty-fifth verse with the fifth of Matthew and seventh verse of Mark must be in consequence of the words having been originally in the Greek.

Matt. xix. 13—30; Mark x. 13—31; Luke xviii. 15—30.

In this passage Bishop Marsh traces considerable verbal resemblance, and the resemblance being in the conversation, the conversation must have been carried on in that language which has preserved the verbal resemblance; this might be expected, for the Lord was now east of Jordan, a district which, according to Hug, was mostly in possession of the Greeks.

The quotations by our Lord from the Old Testament in this passage (Matt. xix. 18, 19), agreeing verbatim with the Septuagint, strongly corroborate the position that the discourse was in Greek; but a quotation in the immediately

* If Peter was a translation, why was not "Simon Bar-jona" translated?

Digitized by Google

preceding context firmly establishes the fact. Hug has used this quotation (Matt. xix. 5) in proof of Matthew having written his Gospel in Greek. It is doubtless good for that, but it goes farther, because the argument is not Matthew's, but our Lord's, and the proof lies in the words, "they twain," which are in the Septuagint, but are not in the Hebrew; our Lord, therefore, must have derived them from the Greek, and must have urged the authority of the Greek Scriptures upon his hearers.

Matt. xxi. 12, 13; Mark xi. 15—19; Luke xix. 45—48.

The resemblance in the twelfth verse of Matthew, with its parallels, being in the narrative, cannot be accounted for by the language in use at the time. Comparing St. Mark's account, which appears more precise as to time, and more copious as to incident, I should suppose that Matthew had not been an eye-witness. The quotation from Isaiah in Mark, verse 17, and its parallels, agrees both with the Septuagint and Hebrew; there is nothing, therefore, I conceive, in this paragraph which would show that our Lord's language was Greek upon this occasion; and perhaps, from his being in the Temple, the contrary would be inferred. There are, however, indications in this chapter which make it probable that Greek was the language very generally in use, even at Jerusalem, during the period of the Passover.

The money-changers, and those who sold the animals for sacrifice, did not look for their customers from among the Jews of Jerusalem; they posted themselves in the temple for the convenience of those Jews who came from a distance, who could not bring their sacrifices with them, and who might not have the half-shekel "according to the shekel of the sanctuary," which each person was obliged to pay individually for himself. It is to be observed that it was at the season of the Passover on both occasions when our Lord cleared the temple, when "devout men" from a distance were congregated there; and perhaps, looking at second causes, the impunity upon each occasion might be attributed to the much stronger feeling of reverence felt towards him by those who were not under the influence of the Pharisaic party of Judea.

Saint John also tells us that certain Greeks desired to see Jesus, an incident which Mr. Greswell inserts at the seventeenth verse of this chapter; they, I presume, must have talked Greek, yet there is no intimation that the language used by them was different from that of others.

Digitized by Google

Again, the quotation in the sixteenth verse of Matthew is from the Septuagint; so that upon the whole it is probable that our Lord conversed in Greek upon this occasion.

Matt. xxi. 23—27, 33—46; Mark xi. 27—xii. 12;
Luke xxi. 1—19.

In this section the events of the following day are recorded. Here we find considerable verbal harmony in the conversation. And as our Lord was teaching the people and declaring the glad tidings in the temple when interrupted by the chief priests and scribes, we must inquire whether it was probable that his discourses in the temple at this time would have been in the Greek language.

The multitude addressed by the Lord, all held that John was a prophet (verse 26); they were not favourably disposed towards the chief priests and elders, and they were well inclined towards the Lord (verse 46). We find, from the parable of the two sons, that the publicans and harlots were amongst those who were eagerly attentive to hear him (Matt. xxi. 31); from the parable of the wicked husbandmen that the privileges of the theocracy were to be taken from the Jewish rulers, and to pass to the Gentiles (Matt. xxi. 43); from the parable of the marriage feast, that whilst those first invited would be rejected, others, both bad and good, the Hellenists and Jews not residing in Judea, as also perhaps the Gentiles, would be admitted (Matt. xxii. 10); and yet, though the whole tenor of his preaching was against the Pharisaic party, it gave satisfaction rather than offence to the multitude. Now our Lord, when interrupted by the rulers, would have been addressing himself to those most willing to hear him, in the language most generally understood by them; and if this included those Jews from a distance whose prejudices were not already awakened by the rulers at Jerusalem; if it included the publicans and harlots, who, as I have already observed, were most conversant with the Greek; if, in short, he was addressing those who were not under the influence of the Pharisaic party, it is not improbable that his discourses were in the Greek language. And therefore, when the elders challenged his authority, it would have been in the Greek language also. Hence I suppose that the verbal resemblance in the conversation in this passage is to be attributed to the language having been Greek, which is confirmed by the quotation in the forty-second verse of

Digitized by Google

Matthew, with the parallels, agreeing verbatim with the Septuagint.*

Bearing in mind the cause of our Lord's popularity with the multitude, we are able to discern how much of the wisdom of the serpent there was in the next step of the Pharisees. They sent certain of their own party with the Herodians, in order to ensnare him in his discourse, that by means of his words they might deliver him to the governor.

From the nature of the question propounded (Mark xii. 13—15) one may infer that as the Pharisees were opposed to, so the Herodians were in favour of, paying tribute to Cæsar. Probably they belonged to Herod's jurisdiction (Galilee), and had adopted, or at least countenanced, the Gentilizing tendencies of the family, and were willing that Herod should hold his authority from the Gentile usurper. Now to admit the lawfulness of Cæsar's claim to tribute, was, in the estimation of the Pharisees, the resignation of their hopes with regard to the Messiah, who they expected would seize the throne of David, and "put to flight the armies of the aliens." Upon this one question here propounded, therefore, the side taken by them was the popular one; but as to any other point of difference between the two parties, as to laxity or scrupulousness in the observance of the law, the multitudes who followed the Lord would have leaned to the Herodian rather than to the Pharisaic view.

The question, then, was full of subtilty, for had our Lord urged the payment of tribute, all the expectations of the people as to his being the King of Israel (John xii. 13, 15,) would have been extinguished, his popularity would have been at an end, and the Pharisees would have been able to arrest him without fear. They therefore anticipated a reply, which seemed the only alternative, when they would have been able to say with some show of truth, "We found this [man] perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ [the] king." (Luke xxiii. 2.)

I think it probable, therefore, that this conversation intended by the Pharisees for the multitude, for the Herodians, and for the Roman authorities, was in Greek. So also was the continuation of the discourse by the Sadducees, as the quotation (Matt. xxii. 32) agreeing with the Septuagint, and

* From the pleasurable surprise with which the Jews at Jerusalem heard Paul speak Hebrew (Acts xxii. 2), it is evident that had he addressed them in Greek it would not have been unusual.

Digitized by Google

not with the Hebrew, demonstrates. The resemblance in verse 44 is to be accounted for in a similar manner.

Matt. xxiv. 1—36; Mark xiii. 1—36; Luke xxi. 5—36.

I have already suggested that, during the latter part of his ministry, our Lord discoursed with his disciples chiefly in the Greek, from which cause I derive the great verbal resemblance in this prophecy.

I suppose that the verbal resemblance in the twenty-sixth of Matthew is attributable to the conversation having been in Greek; the quotation in the thirty-first verse, agreeing with the Septuagint, confirms it.

Verbal Correspondence in Sections common to only two of the Gospels.

Matt. xiv. 22, 34; Mark vi. 45, 53.

The resemblance being in the narrative, and not in conversation, must, I suppose, be attributed to the same common authority. As Mark alone mentions Bethsaida (of Galilee), Peter's native place, perhaps the relation was from Peter.

Matt. xv. 7—10; Mark vii. 6, 7, 14.

The disciples were eating with defiled hands, contrary to the traditions observed by "the Pharisees and all the Jews," (Mark vii. 3,) which shows their strong Gentile tendencies. Our Lord's quotation agreeing with the Septuagint, and not with the Hebrew, seems to imply that the conversation was in Greek. It is most probable that the appeal to the people (verse 10) was in Greek. Matthew has probably preserved the conversation in the correct order, and the first part of our Lord's reply to the Scribes and Pharisees who came from Jerusalem may have been in Aramaic; but for the sake of the disciples, the latter part was in Greek. The sudden transition from one language to another will not appear strange to any one who has been in localities where two languages are prevalent.

Matt. xv. 26, 32; Mark vii. 27, viii. 1, 2.

The discourse with the Greek woman was doubtless in Greek, and when our Lord was passing through Decapolis (Mark vii. 31) the multitude who "glorified the God of Israel" (Matt. xv. 31) were, one would suppose, Gentiles, who hitherto had not believed in "the God of Israel."

Digitized by Google

Matt. xix. 5, 6; Mark x. 7—9.

In this passage our Lord must have been speaking Greek; for, as I have already observed, he evidently quoted from the Septuagint, because his argument turns upon the words "they twain," which are in the Septuagint, but are not in the Hebrew.

Matt. xx. 22—28; Mark x. 38—45.

Our Lord's converse with his disciples, as I have already observed, was now most probably in the Greek language. To that cause I should attribute the verbal resemblance in this passage. But as Matthew did not hear the first part of the discourse (Matt. xx. 24), he and Mark might both have heard it repeated by the same individual.

Matt. xxiv. 22; Mark xiii. 20.

I have already observed that this prophecy was delivered in Greek.

Sections common to Mark and Luke only.

Mark i. 24, 25; Luke iv. 34, 35.

The language might have been Greek, or the similarity may have been from the narration of the same individual, probably Peter.

Mark viii. 38; Luke ix. 26.

I have already observed that the language upon this occasion was Greek.

Mark ix. 38, 40; Luke ix. 49, 50.

The resemblance here is I conceive attributable to the conversation having been in Greek; had the verbal similarity proceeded from the two evangelists having used some common written original, or derived their knowledge from some stereotyped oral Gospel, we should not have expected to find part of the same discourse, wholly in another connexion in Luke. (Chap. xvii. 1—3.)

Sections common to Matthew and Luke only.

Matt. v. 44, with Luke vi. 27, 28; and Matt. vii. 5, with Luke vi. 42; also Matt. vi. 11, with Luke ix. 3.

The sermon on the Mount having been delivered in the hearing of a mixed multitude, some from Decapolis, some from the country beyond Jordan (Matt. iv. 25), and some

Digitized by Google

from Tyre and Sidon (Luke vi. 17), was, I doubt not, in the Greek language. In Matt. v. 47, 48, from the seeming jingle in Greek between "publicans" and "perfect," Welstein argues that it was written (or rather I should say *spoken*) in Greek.* In Matthew vi. 16, the Paranomasia, in like manner, intimates a Greek original. Bishop Jebb's remarks on this portion of Scripture, in his "*Sacred Literature*," strongly imply a Greek original.

Matt. viii. 8—10; Luke vii. 6—9.

There is some difference between the two evangelists, in the account of the healing of the Centurion's servant. Matthew says that the Centurion came to our Lord; Luke says that, in the first instance, he sent elders of the Jews, and subsequently some of his own friends; and yet, although there is this difference, there is a verbal resemblance in part of the conversation. Now a common written original, or a stereotyped oral one, cannot account for the verbal identity, because, in that case, the discrepancy could not have occurred.

It is remarkable also that there is no verbal resemblance in the message borne by the elders of the Jews; but the resemblance is observable in the message borne by the friends of the Centurion. Is it not allowable to suppose that the elders addressed our Lord in Aramaic, but that the Gentiles used the Greek language?

Matt. viii. 20, 22; Luke ix. 58, 60.

It would be difficult also to account for the verbal resemblance in this passage, upon the supposition of a common written or stereotyped oral original, the connexion is so different. It appears probable that the language of our Lord was Greek.

Matt. xi. 3—11, 16—19; Luke vii. 19—28, 31—35.

Matthew probably was absent at this time, so perhaps some might be inclined to attribute his verbal resemblance with Luke in this passage to the same source of information. But it appears much more probable that the messengers which the Baptist sent from the southern extremity of Peræa, spoke Greek, and that our Lord continued to address the "publicans" and multitudes in the same language.

Matt. xii. 41—45; Luke xi. 32, 31, 24—26.

The Lord had now withdrawn to the sea to avoid the

* But against this it may be urged that Griesbach gives a various reading,—"heathen," instead of "publicans."

Digitized by Google

Pharisees, and as the multitudes who followed him were partly from Idumea, and beyond the Jordan, and from Tyre and Sidon (Mark iii. 7, 8), it is probable that our Lord's addresses were in Greek.

Matt. xiii. 33; Luke xiii. 20, 21.

We learn from St. Mark (iv. 11) that the multitudes present were composed of "them that were without," that is, I suppose, the Gentiles; the language therefore was Greek.

Matt. xxiii. 37, 38; Luke xiii. 34, 35.

The connexion in which this passage occurs in Matthew, being so different from that in Luke, militates against either the theory of a common documentary, or a stereotyped oral original. And the resemblance being in our Lord's own words, leads to the conclusion that the language was Greek, as we have already observed with regard to the twenty-fourth of Matthew.

Having now gone through the sections mentioned by Dr. Davidson, where verbal resemblance is found, I must now, according to promise, shortly notice those quotations by our Lord from the Old Testament, which do not agree with the Septuagint.

The first exception is Matthew xi. 10, together with the parallels, Mark i. 2, and Luke vii. 27. Here the evangelists differ both from the Septuagint and the Hebrew, from which, therefore, no positive argument can be raised either for or against the theory. Stewart supposes that the quotation is rendered from the Hebrew, whilst Randolph supposes some corruption in the text. Now, according to the theory proposed, the quotation as it occurs in Mark's Gospel should agree with the Hebrew, because it is introduced as cited by the evangelist himself; but as it occurs in Matthew and Luke, it should agree with the Septuagint, because in those Gospels it occurs as the quotation by our Lord. Now it is a fact that verbal resemblance is found between passages in the more modern manuscripts of the Gospels, where, in the more ancient examples, the verbal resemblance is wanting, shewing that verbal resemblance, in some instances, is to be accounted for by a tampering with the text, in order to produce uniformity. Now in no case would such a tampering be more likely than in the one where the same passage from the Old Testament was quoted differently by different evangelists. I do not say positively that this was

Digitized by Google

the case here, but it does not appear an improbable conjecture that the present reading may have been formed from the Hebrew, the Greek, and perhaps Luke i. 76; Matthew xxii. 37, is the next exception. Our Lord's answer to the lawyer at Jerusalem, we might expect to have been taken from the Hebrew scriptures.

Matthew xxvii. 46.

This exception is a great confirmation of the theory. When our Lord spoke in Hebrew, the quotation differed from the Septuagint, which leads us to infer that, when the quotation does agree with the Septuagint, and not with the Hebrew, he used the Greek version.

Luke xxii. 37.

Our Lord was not in controversy with enemies who might cavil at his words; but discoursing with his disciples, and the sense being the same, he may have rendered from the Hebrew, as probably as quoted from the Septuagint.

The only objection which I can anticipate to the theory, taken as a whole—I speak not of exceptions to the detail—is the opinion that Matthew originally wrote his Gospel in Aramaic. This paper has already been extended to such a length, that I can only refer to Dr. Davidson for the arguments in favour of such a supposition, and to a long and able note of Moses Stewart, in Fosbrook's edition of Hug, against it. I think I may be permitted to add, that if the arguments on either side were at all equally balanced before, the powerful internal evidence against an Aramaic original which this theory supplies, may be sufficient to establish the blessed fact, that not only is the present Greek text of Matthew the original of that apostle, but that in many of the discourses we have the identical words of our Lord himself. An original Aramaic gospel would have recorded events—of which there must have been many—connected with our Lord's discourses in that language, and therefore in the locality of Judea rather than of Galilee.

Digitized by Google

Art. II.—DAVID'S THRONE GUARANTEED BY THE BIRTH OF THE VIRGIN'S SON.

One of the wondrous titles given to our blessed Lord is "the beginning of the creation of God." * It does not mean simply that he is the *beginner* of the creation, the *producer*, the *originator*; but that he was the *foundation* of creation, as it were *the first stone laid.* His *essential* dignity was that of "God *of* God, Light *of* Light, Very God *of* very God;" but He condescended to come into an *assumed* relation, in order to fulfil the purpose of God. That assumed relationship is involved in his name, "THE CHRIST," and it was, by virtue of it, that creation was called into existence. "Without him, without the eternal Son, the Word, or the Christ, (for both terms are equivalent) nothing would have been made that was made."† He is the foundation of all creation, all that *has* been, all that *shall* be. But, for a long time, this foundation was not *manifested.* At length, however, at the incarnation, it came into the region of the visible, and it may well be imagined how, on this eventful occasion, the angels of God sang their chorus of gladness, and were thrown into ecstacy when they beheld "God manifest in the flesh."

It is an interesting theme to contemplate the *progress* of this great manifestation—the steps by which the disclosure has been made to us, of Him, who was "the beginning of the creation of God." Man's sin was the first signal for His announcement. God said, "the seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent." ‡ Afterwards, the revelation became further expanded, when God said to Abraham, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."§ At length, it became still more explicit, when God told David that of the fruit of his loins he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne.|| And, in the seventh chapter of Isaiah, we find God opening out his revealed purpose in the Lord Jesus Christ, as the Son of David, still more fully; and shewing *the method whereby it should be accomplished.* At first He had merely said, "*the seed of the woman* shall bruise the serpent's head;" then, that in *the* "*seed of Abraham* all nations of the earth shall be blessed;" then, that as

* Rev. iii. 14. † John i. 3. ‡ Gen. iii. 15.
§ Gen. xxii. 18.
|| 2 Sam. vii. 12—17; Psa. lxxxix. 35, 36.

Digitized by Google

David's Son he should sit upon his throne. But now, He declares the *method* whereby this should be brought about: "*Behold, a Virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.*"

The occasion, it is to be observed, when God breaks forth into this plainness of utterance, was when there was an attempt to baffle His purpose touching the throne of David. The chapter begins with the circumstantial detail of this: "And it came to pass in the days of Ahaz, the son of Jotham, the son of Uzziah, king of Judah, that Rezin the king of Syria, and Rekah the son of Remaliah, king of Israel, went up toward Jerusalem to war against it, but could not prevail against it." It appears they had *previously* attacked the kingdom of Judah with success, having carried off many captives. And, it would seem, encouraged by their past success, they now came up against the capitol itself. When, therefore, intelligence of this design reached the ears of Ahaz, he was thrown into great dismay: "And it was told the house of David, saying, Syria is confederate with Ephraim; and his heart was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind." This account should be viewed in connexion with the twenty-eighth chapter of the Second Book of Chronicles, which tells us of the character of Ahaz: "Ahaz was twenty years old when he began to reign; and he reigned sixteen years in Jerusalem; but he did not that which was right in the sight of the Lord, like David his father," &c. "Wherefore the Lord his God delivered him into the hand of the king of Syria, and they smote him, and carried away a great multitude of them captives, and brought them to Damascus. And he was also delivered into the hand of the king of Israel, who smote him with a great slaughter. For Pekah the son of Remaliah slew in Judah an hundred and twenty thousand in one day, which were all valiant men; because they had forsaken the Lord God of their fathers." Now, all this having happened, no wonder that Ahaz, when he heard of this fresh demonstration of attack on the part of the combined kings of Syria and Israel, was dismayed, and that his "heart was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind." It was only a fulfilment of what God had once said, that the shaking of a leaf would dismay Israel.* No matter what fortifications surrounded the city,—no matter what "valiant men," Ahaz had,—his conscience misgave him, for he knew that he had

* Leviticus xxvi. 36.

Digitized by Google

"forsaken the God of his fathers." It will be well not to forget the application of this to Britain. Mention has been made of the exposed state of our own island. The greatest captain of the age has said that we are defenceless, and the nation has been summoned, on his authority, to take immediate measures for providing against invasion. But suppose all this to be done, and the crisis of danger to have actually arrived, surely it is not too much to say, that no matter what our defences, in the way of fortifications,—no matter how famed our soldiers for their valour and hardihood, it would avail us nothing, having forsaken as a nation the God of our fathers. We should prove very cowards in the midst of all such resources.

Notwithstanding, however, the wickedness of Ahaz and his people (for it would seem they were alike), God had declared that the Son of David should sit upon his throne, and the design of this confederacy being to subvert it, hence, God interposes for *his name's sake:* "Then said the Lord unto Isaiah, Go forth now to meet Ahaz, thou and Shearjashub thy son, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool, in the highway of the fuller's field." It is very possible that Ahaz was employed there in making what provision he could against his enemies; perhaps he was cutting off the water, and turning it into the city, that his enemies might be distressed for the want of this necessary resource. But now, what is Isaiah commanded to do? "And say unto him, Take heed, and be quiet; fear not, neither be fainthearted, for the two tails of these smoking firebrands, for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria, and of the son of Remaliah." God's anger against these kings may be seen, from the contemptuous terms in which he speaks of them, "*the two tails of these smoking firebrands.*"

But *judgment* is also denounced: "Because Syria, Ephraim, and the son of Remaliah, have taken evil counsel against thee, saying, Let us go up against Judah, and vex it, and let us make a breach therein for us, *and set a king in the midst of it,* even the son of Tabeal." Here was their impiety. To attack Jerusalem did not suffice. Nor did it suffice that they had wearied the King of Judah, harassed and molested him in every possible way. Now, they wanted to set up another king: "Let us make a breach therein for us, *and set a king in the midst of it, even the son of Tabeal.* Thus saith the Lord God, It shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass. For the head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rezin;" that is, according to our idiom, "as

Digitized by Google

surely as the head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rezin." And so we may read, in continuation, the former part of the ninth verse, which seems legitimately to come in here, "*as surely as* the head of Ephraim is Samaria, and the head of Samaria is Remaliah's son; within threescore and five years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people." "Ephraim," that is, the ten tribes,—Israel.

Now, whence this denunciation against Israel, that within sixty-five years it should be broken, that it be not a people? *Because they were jealous of the royalty of David's house.* They had conspired together with Syria, to disturb the succession to David's throne. *Therefore,* God pronounces judgment upon them, and it was duly fulfilled. For, in twenty-one years after, multitudes were carried away captive from Samaria; and, in sixty-five years, *complete* devastation ensued, and Israel ceased to be a people; they were carried into the land of their enemies. Nor have they ever since been heard of as a nation.

A key is here furnished to the understanding of a prophecy in Jeremiah, the alleged fulfilment of which, in the Gospel by Saint Matthew, is somewhat obscure. In the thirty-first chapter of Jeremiah, we read, from the seventh verse: "For thus saith the Lord; Sing with gladness for Jacob, and shout among the chief of the nations: publish ye, praise ye, and say, O Lord, save thy people, the remnant of Israel. Behold, I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the coasts of the earth, and with them the blind and the lame, the woman with child, and her that travaileth with child, together a great company shall return thither. Therefore, they shall come and sing in the height of Zion, and shall flow together to the goodness of the Lord, for wheat, and for wine, and for oil, and for the young of the flock, and of the herd; and their soul shall be as a watered garden; and they shall not sorrow any more at all. Then shall the virgin rejoice in the dance, both young men and old together: for I will turn their mourning into joy, and will comfort them, and make them rejoice from their sorrow. And I will satiate the soul of the priests with fatness, and my people shall be satisfied with my goodness, saith the Lord." Now, in order to heighten the effect of this picture of happiness which shall be enjoyed by Israel, the Spirit contrasts with it their past experience, when they were led into captivity: "Thus saith the Lord, A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping; Rachel weeping for her children, refused to be comforted for her children, because they

Digitized by Google

were not." Rachel, we must bear in mind, was the mother of Joseph and Benjamin; and Joseph's son, Ephraim, represents *the ten tribes;* therefore, it is that in reference to their deportation from their land, Rachel is represented as weeping for her children, weeping for their calamity; who being thus called up for effect, the prophet adds,—"Thus saith the Lord, Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears: for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord; and *they shall come again from the land of the enemy.*" This shows what the mournful event is which had been contemplated,—the deportation of Rachel's children, the ten tribes. Now what was the cause of this visitation, the subject, as it were, of Rachel's lamentation? Is it not rehearsed here? *Their jealousy against the destined royalty of the house of David.* And now let us observe how this same jealous feeling in the breast of Herod operated against the Jewish people afterwards. In the second chapter of Matthew the account is given. Upon inquiry being made by the Magi concerning the newly-born King of the Jews, Herod at once takes alarm, and, in a fit of jealousy, sends forth and slays all the children that were in Bethlehem, from two years old and under. This he did in order to make sure of killing his royal victim. Hereupon the prophecy of Jeremiah is said to have been fulfilled,—"Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not."* The slaughter of these innocents in the very locality of her burying-place, equally with the captivity of her descendants, the ten tribes, had resulted from jealousy of the honours of David's house; and so, with obvious propriety, her lamentation, as if awoke up from her grave under the one calamity, is contemplated as including the other.

But, to proceed. This prophecy, in the seventh chapter of Isaiah, against the enemies of the house of David, reaching forward for its fulfilment to a time beyond that of Ahaz, (for, as observed in verse 8, sixty-five years were to elapse before Israel's disorganization was to be completed,)—*this* did not suffice with God for the encouragement of Ahaz; therefore we read,—"Moreover, the Lord spake again unto Ahaz, saying, Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God: ask it either in the depth or in the height above;" that is, since the retribution threatened on Israel was comparatively so remote,

* Matt. i. 17, 18.

Digitized by Google

king Ahaz is invited to ask the sign of some immediate or proximate event, by which he might have his faith confirmed. Nor should we think that his asking a sign accordingly would have rendered him obnoxious to the Divine displeasure; for Abraham* asked for a sign, and God gave him one. Again, Gideon† sought a sign, as also did Hezekiah,‡ and it was granted. Therefore Ahaz, if he had a mind to believe God, had now an opportunity of having his faith confirmed and strengthened. But, alas! under pretence of not tempting God, he refuses: "But Ahaz said, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord," that is, *distrust* him. Examining closely into the history given us in the books of Kings and Chronicles, we find the secret of this evasive speech,—he was looking for help to Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria; trusting in him, therefore, he did not seek for help from God. It was not that he was already confiding in God, but, having forsaken him, he was hoping for aid from another quarter.§ Then the prophet says,—"Hear ye now, O house of David: is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also?" The wearying of men might refer possibly to his wearying the Prophet Isaiah himself, who, doubtless, had often remonstrated with him; now he is told he wearies God.

The prophet proceeds:—"Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign," that is, let us remember, a sign that Ephraim should be broken from being a nation, because they had sought to disturb the due succession to the throne of David; a sign, in fact, that *every confederacy* against the throne of David should fail,—"Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." We know that virgin was the Virgin Mary; accordingly, the great mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh, the incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ, is here spoken of by God as a sign, a token that nothing shall ever invalidate his gracious purpose touching the throne of David, that it stands fast for ever.‖ Therefore, the event of the Incarnation should never be thought of without our recollecting, amongst other things, that David's throne is to be established. Many professing Christians, alas! meditate upon this event, but think not of the purpose of God concerning the throne of David, although such event is here appealed to to verify the Divine faithfulness in this very matter. May we not read

* Gen. xv. 8. † Judges vi. 36, 37. ‡ Isa. xxxviii. 22, 7, 8.
§ 2 Chron. xxviii. 16, 20—23, and Isa. vii. 9, last cl.; 2 Kings xvi. 7—19. ‖ See Psal. lxxxix. 3, 4, 27—29, 34—37.

Digitized by Google

Scripture so unintelligibly, but rather may we seek to have communion with our God touching *all* his counsels which he discloses to us, especially that on which he is so emphatic, the setting up of the throne of David!

Having pronounced this remarkable prophecy,—"Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son," the prophet adds,—"Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good." Who is this that shall "eat butter and honey?" In order to ascertain this it must be remembered *who had accompanied the prophet.* He had been told to take with him Shear-jashub, his son,* and the original implies that he was but *an infant.* The purport of this we now learn. It was that pointing to Shear-jashub, the prophet might, through *him,* give this further and proximate token of God's faithfulness. "Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good;" that is, he should be nourished with the richest commodities of the land, that his attainment to some degree of discernment might be accelerated. "For," adds the prophet, or, as it should be, "*Surely,*" (the word is so rendered verse 9,) "before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings;" that is, (Shear-jashub, being then an infant,) before he should know "to refuse the evil and choose the good," the threatened judgment upon the enemies of David's throne would begin to be inflicted. The land that Ahaz abhorred should be forsaken of both her kings. This proximate event was to be an earnest of the threatened disorganization of Israel, and of the fulfilment of the prophecy concerning the virgin's Son. Looking now at the record of what happened within the period thus marked out, we find from the 15th chapter of the 2d book of Kings, 27th verse, that, "In the two-and-fiftieth year of Azariah, king of Judah, *Pekah,* the son of Remaliah, began to reign over Israel in Samaria, and reigned twenty years." *Pekah reigned twenty years.* We consult next, verses 32, 33:—"In *the second year of Pekah,* the son of Remaliah, king of Israel, began Jotham, the son of Uzziah, king of Judah, to reign. Five-and-twenty years old was he when he began to reign, and he reigned *sixteen years* in Jerusalem." We here gather a further element of computation,—that Jotham began his reign in the second year of Pekah's, and reigned sixteen years. Combining these notes of information, it is plain that the twentieth year of Pekah's reign, when he died, can have

* Ver. 3.

Digitized by Google

extended only into the third year of Jotham's *successor*, who was *Ahaz*. Therefore, in the third year of Ahaz, Pekah closed his career; so that he could not have survived three years after this invasion of Ahaz's dominions. Now this is just the term that we should assign to the ripening of an infant child into a discerning exercise of its senses. Of the manner in which Pekah's career was closed, within the interval in question, we are informed in ver. 30: "And Hosheah, the son of Elah, made a conspiracy against Pekah, the son of Remaliah, and smote him, and slew him, and reigned in his stead, in the twentieth year of Jotham, the son of Uzziah." Here it is said that Pekah was slain in the twentieth year of Jotham: but this obviously means the twentieth year *after Jotham began his reign*, otherwise there would be a discordance with the statement in verses 32, 33. Therefore, before three years expired, Pekah ceased to reign. Thus the word of the Lord proved true. Before the prophet's child attained to the brief term defined, Pekah, one of the kings in question, was deprived of life.

With regard to the other king, Rezin, we read of his end, at the 9th verse of the 16th chapter, "And the king of Assyria hearkened unto him," (that is, unto Ahaz, who, at this time, called in his aid,) "for the king of Assyria went up against Damascus, and took it, and carried the people of it captive to Kir, *and slew Rezin*." Thus both these presumptuous kings were cut off—the proximate event spoken of as a sign, and the earnest of the more remote event that occurred in the course of sixty-five years afterwards, the disorganization of Ephraim or the ten tribes, encouraging, also, the confidence of faith in the mysterious pledge of the birth of the virgin's Son accomplished at length at Bethlehem, when the infant Jesus was born, amidst the carols of the heavenly host proclaiming "glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill towards men." And loudly should have sounded forth the hosannahs of the Jewish people when thus David's Lord became David's son, and when at once, in the person of Emmanuel, the root and offspring of David appeared to finish iniquity, transgression, and sin, and to bring in an everlasting righteousness. But, alas! Jerusalem knew not the day of her visitation, and thus, during this dispensation of ours, the promises of God concerning the Jewish people lie dormant. An interruption has occurred to their fulfilment. The virgin's Son has indeed been born; yea, according to the promise, has risen from the dead, and he is now the King of the Jews, ready to take to

Digitized by Google

himself his great power and reign. But whilst blindness is upon Israel, the eternal purpose of God, in their Messiah, is taking effect in us poor sinners of the Gentiles. Now is being developed to the admiration of principalities and powers in the heavenly places, the mystery of the calling of the Church, whereby all that believe in Jesus are being made heirs with him of that glory which shall be revealed when he comes again. With what joy then, reader, should *we* celebrate the advent of the Son of God, both in grace and glory. Herein the *Jews* are interested, and the Gentile world, yea, the whole *creation* at large is interested in it. Hence it is represented as longing for the day of "the manifestation of the sons of God."* But surely those sons of God themselves are *especially* called on to rejoice, as they are *now* brought nigh by the blood of Jesus, reconciled *now* by the blood of his cross.

Oh, how deeply anxious should we be, standing in such relationship, to estimate aright *all* that is bound up in the birth of the Saviour, to understand the incarnation, not only as the basis of union between God and human nature at large, but as the sure pledge for the raising up of David's throne—that ordinance of God for the right government of the world. Above all, we should realize for ourselves that, in his death and resurrection, our sins are put away, and that we have access to God as our Father. We should contemplate, moreover, the day when that same Jesus who appeared in humiliation will come again in like manner as he went into heaven—when we shall see him as he is, and be made like him in his everlasting and glorious kingdom. Such is the right celebration of Emmanuel's birth. Standing upon the pedestal of the past we should look out from thence for that glorious hope which is coming, and not to ourselves only as the Church of God, but to Israel and the nations. For when Jesus comes he will come to reign, to raise up the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down, and, sitting upon the throne of David, he will be the ordinance of God for blessing and governing the world in righteousness.

* Romans viii. 19.

Digitized by Google

Art. III.—THE JUDGMENT TO COME.

One of the most important topics that can occupy our attention is THE JUDGMENT TO COME. Yet regarding this there is great cause to fear that the spirits of many are deterred from the examination of it by the force of early but incorrect impressions; and, therefore, while on all other points of revealed truth a growth of faith, and of knowledge and understanding is perceptible, on this point alone there is no advance on the part of multitudes around us.

Let us, therefore, with the view of opening this matter a little, take the simplest and best method, viz., begin at the beginning. Take as a ground-text 2 Tim. iv. 1: "The Lord Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." Now it is the judgment of the quick—that is, the living—we are now to consider, and the abundance of materials laid to our hand will make our task an easy and most instructive one.

The first time the word "*judge*" occurs in Scripture with a distinct explanation of its meaning is in Exodus. Observe the word in Ex. ii. 14; Acts vii. 35, shows that it means "deliverer;" Ex. xviii. 13—16, 22, shows farther that *teaching* the statutes and laws of God is included in it: not merely *deciding* quarrels, as in modern courts of law, but ruling, guiding, directing in God's ways, all over whom they were set to judge; the form of the office being, of course, varied according to the condition of those judged. The whole history of Moses as the leader, teacher, guide, and ruler of Israel may be summed up in the word, "he *judged* Israel;" and Num. xxvii. 15—23 shows, that Joshua, who followed him in his work and charge, was also "judge of Israel." But proceeding to examine the book of Judges we shall find more light still. In Judg. ii. 16—19 we have the fullest definition of the term, and the subsequent chapters abundantly prove that the office of Judge included warrior, avenger, deliverer, teacher, (sometimes prophet, as Deborah,) guide, ruler, preserver, and, indeed, Saviour. (See Obad. ver. 24.) From Judges ii. 18, 19, it is clearly intimated that if a judge had been found who should not die, the children of Israel had *never* fallen again under the power of their enemies. Compare Joshua xxiv. 31, or Judges ii. 7, with 1 Samuel vii. 15; with Psalm lxxii. 7, and Jer. xxiii. 6; Acts xvii. 31; Phil. i. 6, and we shall find a beam of light on this point: but without antici-

Digitized by Google

pating, let us follow the narrative of the book of Judges. In ch. iii. 10, 11, we find that Othniel had judged Israel forty years; *that* was *his day* of judgment, or time of rule and government. Ehud's day was longer—eighty years (ver. 30); Deborah's day, forty years (v. 31); Gideon's day, also forty years (viii. 28); Abimelech's, three years (ix. 22); Tola's day, twenty-three years (x. 2); Jair's day, twenty-two years (x. 3); Jephthah's day, six years (xii. 7); Ibzan's, seven years; Elon's, ten years; Abdon's, eight years (xii. 8—14); and finally, Samson's day, twenty years (xv. 20). Again, in 1 Sam. vii. 6, 15—17, we find the supreme power lodged in the hands of one who was prophet, priest, and judge all at once. This is a remarkable type of Him who shall one day judge all nations; but we are not now expounding types, but tracing the scriptural import of a word which occurs in various forms many hundreds of times in the Bible. So turn we to 1 Sam. viii. 5, where we have a new idea,—"A king to judge us!" Yes, the word is twice repeated (vers. 6 and 20), so that we have now the key to the use of the word in all the psalms and prophets confirmed by the ground-text we selected (2 Tim. iv. 1); but let us proceed cautiously. The idea of king and judge being alike might have been gathered from Deut. xxxiii. 5, but it was better to wait till successive openings of the word had been presented by the judges from Moses to Samuel; but now we may speak boldly, and sing the song of Hannah (1 Sam. ii.), where, in ver. 10, these words meet, and rejoice as we read, in 2 Sam. viii. 15, that "David reigned, and executed judgment and justice;" and stand still as we open, in 1 Kings iii., the prayer of king Solomon for an "understanding heart to judge the people" (vers. 9—11), and thank God for the explanation of his own word by giving us to see as we do, in chap. vii. 7, that "the *throne*" and the "judgment-seat" are one and the same.

So that now we are in a condition to take up some of the other books of Scripture, Psalms or Prophets, and see how the Spirit of God has spoken regarding the person, and the day, and the work of Him "who was *ordained* of God to be the judge of quick and dead." (Acts x. 42.) This will prove a large field; but let us not be deterred from entering at least a portion of it. The book of Psalms comes first in order; let us begin with that. Ps. i. 5, "*the* judgment;" this is the key-note of all the book. Ps. ii., the "anointed," ordained "king," and judge. Psalm iii. 7 recals Samson; vii. 6—9, presents the character of the judgment; ix. 7, the

Digitized by Google

throne; ver. 8, the world as the subject of the authority of the royal Judge; and all is the judgment of the living, of the nations, of all Jews and heathens; x. 16—18, again king and judge; and so on through all similar Psalms. xviii. is full of the coming, the glory, the avenging. Compare ver. 43 with Psalm xxii. 27, 28, and observe the unity of person and action; xxiv. 7—10, the King of glory, the mighty in battle, suggesting Rev. xix., and many grand prophecies; Psalm xxviii. 7—9, the character of the work of all the judges; xxxiii. 3—5, the new song, the earth full of goodness or mercy, all the new songs have this theme (they are Psalms xxxiii., xl., xcvi., xcviii., cxliv., and cxlix.; Isaiah xlii.; Rev. v. and xiv.) Again, xxxv. 23—28, the cry for judgment; xxxvii. 10, 11, 18, 22, 29, 37, the fruits of the judgment; xliv., the cry again; xlv., the coming of the King greater than Solomon; xlvi., the convulsions of the earth when the evil spirit is cast forth of it: xlvii., the coronation; xlviii., the metropolis; xlix., the parable (waiting for judgment we can bear all evil); and l., the judgment fully. Thus in one-third part of the book of Psalms we have seen how full is every one of this grand subject. It must be so; the humiliation and the exaltation of the Promised One being the text of all. (See Luke xxiv. 44; and 1 Pet. i. 11.) We shall, for brevity's sake, touch the remainder very lightly. Psalm li. is the "Bochim" of Judges ii.; liii. 6, "Oh, for the coming of the Judge!" liv. 7, the deliverer; lv. to lviii., a similar pleading; ver. 11 of Psalm lviii. gives the issue; lix. 13, God ruleth in Jacob. (See Ruth i. 1.) All the sixties is full of the controversy; lxvii. 4, the joy of the judgment, the government, the kingdom of God; lxviii., the opening word is the trumpet-call to march (Num. x. 35); and all is full of judgment; lxxii., *the* Psalm, with its thirty-two times repeated "*shall*," the purpose of God regarding his Son as Lord and Judge of all; vers. 2—4, recals all the judges; ver. 5, the eternity of his judgment; ver. 6, the name of the Lord (Deut. xxxii. 2, 3); ver. 7, *his* days as distinct from the days of all other judges, who were but temporary deliverers; ver. 8, the favoured land; and ver. 9, all beyond it; ver. 10, tributary kings; ver. 11, the Lord of lords the Lord of all; ver. 12, "*For*," observe the reason (recalling Judges ii.); vers. 13, 14, sparing, saving, redeeming, avenging; ver. 15, again "eternal judgment" (Heb. vi. 2); ver. 16, "fear not, little flock," "a multitude which no man could number;" ver. 17, Abraham's covenant (Gen. xii. 3); vers. 18—20, 'Blessed be God for ever," "the *earth* filled with glory!

Digitized by Google

Amen, amen." The consummation of all hope, the fulfilment of all promise, and prophecy, and prayer. Amen. O come quickly, thou Judge of all! Come, and judge! Come, and reign!

Psalm lxxiii. 17—20, sudden work, strange work. Ps. lxxiv. 10, "how long?" ver. 12, "King of *old;*" lxxv. 2, uprightly; lxxvi. full (recalling Ps. xlvi.); lxxvii. 11, "remember works," specially Egypt and Red Sea; lxxviii., mercy and judgment; lxxix. 5, "how long?" lxxx. 4, "how long?" Recollect the cry, Rev. vi. 10; Ps. lxxxi. 10—12, recals the days of the judges; lxxxii., "God judgeth among the gods;" lxxxiii. 9, recals Gideon; and ver. 18, is the issue of the grand judgment, of which all others are but types and shadows. Without stopping at the others, see Ps. xciii., xciv., xcvi., xcviii., and xcix., all occupied with the grand work of judgment, which is too apparent to require particularizing of verses. Ps. c., the song and worship *under* the kingdom or judgment of Christ; ci., "Sing of mercy and judgment." Ps. cii., the work of taking possession of the kingdom; and so on, through the historical Psalms cv., cvi., and cvii. Ps. cviii., is the battle-cry; and cix., the day of vengeance. Ps. cx., fixes the time, ver. 1, "until;" ver. 2, "*rule* thou," or "*judge thou;*" ver. 3, "day of power;" ver. 5, "day of wrath;" ver. 6, "judge among the heathen" (same as Ps. ii. 4). (N.B., "*heads,*" should be *the head, i. e.,* Antichrist.) Ps. cxiii., is another version of Hannah's song of judgment (1 Sam. ii.), and cxiv., is the Exodus; cxviii. 26, "Blessed, he that *cometh,*" *i. e.,* to judge. Here let us stop,—not from want of matter, but of space and time; the last *ten* Psalms alone might fill a page; suffice it to notice cxlix. 9, "the judgment written;" cl., the song of all the redeemed creation! Oh! to hear it burst forth!

But we must also glance at Isaiah, the royal prophet, the prophet of the person and actings of Immanuel. And here we have a glorious field, but must only skim it.

In the first chapter, we have in ver. 25—28, a full and complete work of judgment, deliverance of the Lord's people, and destruction of their enemies. Chap. ii. 2—4, observe the judgment is the *cause* of the work of peace in ver. 4, and is a *work,* not a mere brief act; and "the nations," shows clearly it is the living, not the dead, that are the subjects of this judgment; iii. 13, 14, the people (*i. e.,* the Jews, the covenant people); iv. 4, spirit of judgment, a purifier (this seems the root of the Popish fiction of purgatorial fire); v. 16, 17, cause and effect again; ix. 3—7, a very full

Digitized by Google

passage; ver. 4, day of Midian; ver. 5, (the marginal reading); ver. 6, when the Jews shall truly say so (which they have not yet done), then the action of ver. 7, shall not tarry, —"throne of David," is just the throne of David (see 1 Kings i. 13, 17, 20, 24, 27, 30, 35, 37, 46, 47; and glance at Jer. xxii. 2, 15, 16; Luke i. 32, 33; and Ps. lxxxix.; 2 Sam. vii. 13, and viii. 15.) Chap. xi., the grand prophecy of Paradise regained; ver. 3, 4, proving that through judgment alone, the glory and blessedness of ver. 6—9, can be introduced into this cursed earth. Until the liar and murderer be cast forth, this cannot be; and the work of casting him out, is the work of the right hand of the Lord alone. Chap. xii., the song of the redeemed, "in *that day*," the day of the judgment of the rod of Jesse's stem, the branch of Jesse's roots. Passing the ten burdens of the kingdoms, chap. xiii. to xxiii., with the remark, that all the fulfilments Dr. Keith has noted have but sealed and confirmed the prophetic word; not exhausted it (for many of the terms are too large to admit of any merely temporary fulfilment; such as xiii. 6—13; xiv. 1—7, and 26; xvi. 5; xviii. 7; xix. 18—35, &c.). Passing these burdens meantime, we open at chap. xxiv. the burden of the whole earth, which all admit to be the winding up of this age, or day of grace in righteous judgment. We have here all the signs of Matt. xxiv.; Luke xxi.; 2 Tim. iii.; and 2 Pet. ii.; Rev. iii. 10; vi. 13, 17; and xvi. 13—21; and at the end of the chapter, we have Rev. xix., end; and xx., first part. Thus far the judgment of the quick; that of the dead saints follows, xxv. 8, opened by 1 Cor. xv. 54, and referred to again in xxvi. 19, connected with the coming of the Lord, the Judge, the Saviour, taking vengeance, as in 2 Thess. i. 8—10. Chap. xxvii., corroborates the allusion to Rev. xx.; and presents at the end Israel re-gathered, restored, re-united, and worshipping the Lord in the holy mount at Jerusalem. The grand theme sparkles out, xxviii. 5, 6, 21, 22; xxix. 7, 8, 22—24; xxx. 18, 19, 25—33; and xxxi. 4—9; and xxxii. 1, brings us to the "King reigning in righteousness; and princes ruling in judgment." Compare Matt. xix. 28; ver. 2, "a *man*," no spiritual influence; ver. 15, the latter rain; ver. 16, judgment dwelling in the wilderness, and righteousness in the fruitful field; and ver. 17, "peace for ever." Again, chap. xxxiii. 5, 6, and 17, 20; in a word, all the chapter, specially ver. 22, which recals the words of our ground-text. And chap. xxxiv., is the trumpet-call to the nations, having its counterpart in Rev. xviii.; and chap. xxxv., is the con-

Digitized by Google

summation of blessedness to all the weary earth, through the outcasting of the enemy, and the restoration of the beauty and joy of Paradise. The marginal reading of ver. 8 is the correct one, and teaches that the Lord is there and then, by his name and style, Immanuel.

It is not necessary to quote more from Isaiah; nor will I at present lay my hand upon any of the other prophets. Enough has been obtained from the historical, devotional, and prophetic Scripture, to enable us to come to a clear conception of a most important word; and therefore, we shall proceed to the New Testament with this light, and trace the varied employment of it through the Gospels, and Acts, and Epistles.

Keeping in mind Luke i. 32, 33 (already noted in connexion with 1 Sam. viii. 15, vii. 13, and 1 Kings i., and Isa. ix. 8), we turn up Matt. vii. 21—23, which fixes the person of the Judge, and the character of the intrants into the kingdom of heaven; then turn to chap. x. 14, 15, where a very solemn word is recorded touching "the *day* of judgment." A similar passage is in chap. xi. 20—24. In chap. xii. our attention is fixed, ver. 17—21, by the citation from Isaiah, chap. xlii. A single glance at the context of that chapter, will suffice to confirm all we have seen elsewhere regarding the presence of the Judge, and the mingled *work* of vengeance and deliverance,—of destruction to the adversary, and rescue and blessing and permanent glory to His people. (See particularly from ver. 13 to 16 of Isa. xlii.) Again, in the parables of Matt. xiii., we have the *work* of judgment brought clearly before us, as the appointed *work* of the Son of man, in the end of this world or age,—ver. 39 and 49, recalling the end of Isa. xxviii., and Joel iii. 12. In chap. xvi. 27, we have the coming and judgment; and ver. 28, followed by chap. xvii. 1—9, is explained by St. Peter (2 Ep. i. 17), as a vision of the *coming* majesty and glory of the Lord. Chap. xix. 27—30, we have already anticipated, in noticing Isa. xxxii. 1; but too much attention cannot be paid to such a distinct word as, "judging the twelve tribes of Israel," recalling, as it does, Deut. xxxii. 36; Ps. l. 4; cxxxv. 14; Isa. li. 5; and the glorious Ps. lxxii., and, indeed, the whole strain of prophecy we have been examining. The exposition usually offered by commentators, of this passage in Matt. xix., is most meagre, viz., that the apostles shall merely assent to the sentence pronounced by the Judge of all in the day of account; understanding by that, the day of judgment of the wicked dead; and thus missing the whole

Digitized by Google

truth, that it is the judgment of the quick alone, that is here spoken of. Chap. xxi. 5, being a quotation from Zech. ix. 9, fixes the *person* of the King, and the humble guise in which he came *first;* but the whole context of the prophetic page shows, that the same King who so came, shall again come in glory and majesty,—and judge and have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth. Chap. xxi. 44, is another of those wonderful words, which can alone be understood by the believer in the coming of the Lord to judge the quick: it recals Dan. ii. 44, Ps. ii. 9, and all similar Scriptures.

In chap. xxii., the careful reader will mark the difference between the "sent" of ver. 7, and the "came" of ver. 11; and perceive the decided feature of the day, or time, or age to come, as compared with this present age in ver. 30, (and still more clearly from the parallel passage in Luke xx. 34—36, where the word world should be rendered age). Also in ver. 44, the essentially parenthetical character of this present dispensation is marked by the "UNTIL" of Ps. cx. Again, in chap. xxiii. we have the same vast parenthesis, including all the time of the off-casting of the Jew, and the visiting of the Gentile in mercy, distinctly declared in vers. 38, 39, the slightest consideration of which would teach us, that when that time shall come, the whole of Ps. cxviii. shall go into exact and literal fulfilment. But in chap. xxiv. the truth comes out more fully than elsewhere, for the question raised by that last word is largely and fully answered; and any feeling on our spirits, as if the answer were either a very confused or incomplete one, arises simply from our culpable ignorance of Old Testament language. Observe the two questions put in ver. 3, specially the last, (comparing Mark xiii. and Luke xxi.) The answer to the *first* occupies from ver. 15 to ver. 22, (the first fourteen verses being, in a great measure, common to both, and full of general warning to the Church during the whole of this dispensation); and the corresponding passages, Mark xiii. 14—20, and Luke xxi. 20—24, cast steady light on this weighty matter. Compare also Daniel ix. 23—27, and xii. 11; Lev. xxvi. 27—35; Deut. xxviii., latter part; and there we find the great tribulation of which our Lord speaks here—a tribulation now of nearly 1800 years' duration, but which shall not last for ever. But the answer to the *second* question is the one now in hand, occupying from ver. 23 of chap. xxiv., to the end of chap. xxv. A full exposition here is out of the question; but a glance at the outline may not be unprofitable. Ver. 24

Digitized by Google

is illustrated by 2 Thess. ii. 3—12; Rev. iii. 10, xiii. 13, 14, and xvi. 14. These things are always referred to as immediately preceding the grand object of all hope—the personal appearing of the Lord to judge the world. Ver. 28 points to the translation of the saints. Compare 1 Thess. iv. 15—17; 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52; Luke xvii. 34—37. Ver. 29—31, the visible signs of the Judgment-day having dawned—at the dawn of which all the created ordinances of light and rule hide their light; 32—35, the generation that sees the sign shall see also the thing signified; 36—41, general warnings to all; 42—51, special warnings to the Church, with motives to diligence, faithfulness, and watchfulness. Chap. xxv. needs no comment at present. Suffice it to say, that neither in it, nor in chap. xxiv., is there any mention of, or allusion to, the resurrection of the dead, more than the passing glance of ver. 28, already noticed, recalling John xiv. 3.

Turn we then the leaf, and read chap. xxvi. 29, and meditate the harmony of this announcement with the tone of all the Psalms and passages of Isaiah, where the glory and blessedness of the kingdom are spoken of. Again, ver. 64, our Lord's deposition (for he was put to his *oath* by the High Priest) recals the glorious and crowning act of the Lord's arising and coming to judgment the subject of all the Psalms, and the antitype of all the work of all the judges. Consult again Dan. vii. Finally, in regard to this book of the gospel; see xxviii. 18—20, where we have the ground of the judgment of the nations of Christendom. The word "*until*," or "*unto* the end of the world," (consummation of the age) suggesting both the fact of a judgment to come, and the grounds of that judgment, and the issues of the same.

I shall not travel through Mark and Luke, and shall therefore only touch lightly a few verses in John, where the whole matter is put in the simplest, clearest light, by the very words of the Lord.

And first, in chap. v., from vers. 19 to 30, is a weighty passage, but one that needs only to be read to be understood: ver. 22 teaches the most important truth, that *all* judgment is committed to the Son; which, recollecting what we saw of the meaning of that word in Isaiah and elsewhere, imports that the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, are all His: the work of retribution to all the workers of evil; the work of rewarding all the faithful servants of God; the work of ridding the earth of the liar and murderer, of raising the dead, and removing the curse from off the groaning creation! And observe the order of the work; first a

Digitized by Google

spiritual, then a literal resurrection; the "*and now is*" of ver. 25 are not repeated in ver. 28. Chap. viii. 15 teaches that at that time our Lord had not begun his work of judgment. No. He had to finish His work of witness-bearing; His work of mercy and long-suffering; His work of grace and love. The day of the retribution cometh next. It hath not yet come, but it cometh speedily. The signs of its coming are all visible to the spiritual eye. A sort of judgment is truly proceeding even now; such as proceeded in the days of our Lord's ministry, as intimated, chap. ix. 39, and xii. 31; but the end of chap. xii. teaches clearly, what we have again and again seen to be the testimony of all parts of the record, viz., ver. 47; the first advent was not to judgment, but the second advent is alone for judgment, ver. 48.

And so the first apostles understood the Master; for see how they took up and carried out the testimony. Peter and John in the temple at Jerusalem (Acts iii. 21), teaching the Jews; Peter again at Cesarea teaching Cornelius, (chap. x. 42); Paul at Athens (xvii. 31), and the same Paul again before Felix, (xxiv. 25); and Agrippa, (xxvi. 6); all teach the same thing, point to the same hope, testify of the common salvation,—whether called "the times of the restitution of all things spoken of in the prophets," or "the time of the judgment of the quick and the dead," or "the promises made unto the fathers," or simply "judgment to come." And this, if aught could make it clearer, is made so by the uniform tenor of all the Epistles. Need I do more than note hastily Rom. ii. 16, iii. 6, v. 17, viii. 17—25, (that glorious passage the climax of the argument of the first seven chapters,) and xiv. 10, and 17, which is so often fearfully perverted to shut out the hope of any kingdom at all; but compare on the word "righteousness," Isa. xi. 4, 5; Ps. lxxii. 2, 3; Gal. v. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 8; 2 Pet. iii. 13; and Isa. lxv.—end. On the word "peace," Ps. lxxii. 3, 7; Isa. ii. 1—6; Ps. xlvi.; Matt. x. 34; and Rom. ii. 10. And on the words "joy in the Holy Ghost," Heb. xii. 2; Matt. xxv. 21—23; Isa. xxxv. 2—10, lxv. 18, 19; John xvi. 20; and Jude 24.

Again, 1 Cor. i. 7, the hope; iii. 13, "the day;" and ver. 22, the inheritance; iv. 8, the kingdom; iv. 5, the time; ver. 20, the earnest; vi. 2, the judgment of the world by the saints (see Dan. vii. 22); ver. 3, the judgment of the angels; vii. 31, the interval; ix. 25, the crown; xi. 26, the meat indeed, and the witness-bearing in consequence of feeding on

Digitized by Google

it; chap. xiii. 10, the perfection; ver. 12, the "*now*" and the "*then;*" chap. xv. 23—26, the whole mystery in order; and ver. 50—54, details explanatory of the end of ver. 23. Passing, for shortness' sake, the second Epistle, lest chap. iv. and v. should detain us too long; and that to the Galatians, by merely indicating that the inheritance of chap. iv. is the same as Rom. viii.; the "liberty" of chap. v. is that of John viii.; and the reaping of chap. vi., the harvest of all the prophets and parables, we come to the Epistle to the Ephesians. In chap. i. 10, we find the "dispensation of the fulness of times," which is now intelligible to us, from comparing Luke xxi. 24 with Deut. xxxii. 21, and 35—43, and Rom. x. 19, and xi. 25. Again, in Eph. i. 14, we find the "earnest," the "until," the "redemption of the purchased possession" (the jubilee of the earth); and in ver. 18, "the hope," "the riches of glory," and the "inheritance of God in the saints," all of which are clear from the Psalms and prophets already quoted; ver. 21, the "world to come;" chap. ii. 7, "the ages to come;" and iii. 21, "all ages;" all these words recalling the age, or day, or time, or period of the judgment, the kingdom of our Lord. Take Ps. lxxii., towards the end, as the light and exposition of these very glorious words of Eph. iii.; and as the one bears, that in this all-embracing prayer, the prayers of David are ended, or all summed up; so may we safely say of the other, the prayers of Paul are ended,—more he could not ask. Again, chap. iv. 30, we have "the day of redemption," up to which time the sealing proceeds,—God's plan of which is fully recorded in the preceding part of the chapter. Alas! how departed from! Phil. ii. 10, 11, repeats the glorious theme of Ps. ii., and Isa. ii., and Dan. vii.; and our hope and citizenship are spoken clearly out in chap. iii. 20, 21; to which nothing need be added. Colossians is as full as Ephesians, and Thessalonians wholly occupied with the all-absorbing theme; see specially second Epistle i. 4—10, where the full circle of the work of judgment is drawn: God's people oppressed, the enemy exulting, the rising of the Judge, the coming forth in destructive power on his foes, the rescue of His people, and their consequent glory and blessedness. Chap. ii. is also full of most precious matter, but we have no time at present to open it. In 1 Tim. we have, chap. vi. 14, 15, almost the very words of our ground-text; and the second Epistle is peculiarly full of it: chap. i. 12, "that day," ver. 18, "that day;" ii. 12, the reigning with Him; iv. 1, *our text*, and ver. 8, "that day," and ver. 18, "His heavenly kingdom."

Digitized by Google

To Titus the apostle repeats "the blessed hope, the glorious appearing" (chap. ii. 13), and "the hope of eternal life," chap. i. 2, and iii. 7. The Epistle to the Hebrews is of course full of this matter. Chap. i. 2—8, presents the heir, the throne, the sceptre; ver. 9, the anointing; ver. 13, "*until;*" chap. ii. 5, "the world to come;" ver. 8, "*not yet;*" ver. 4—9, "rest that remaineth;" v. 10, King and Priest for ever; vi. 2, "*eternal judgment;*" viii., the new covenant with Israel and Judah. (See Jer. xxxi., whence the quotation is taken, and read chap. xxx. as the necessary and only conceivable introduction to it.) Chap. ix. 28, the appearing "unto salvation" of those looking for Him, recals the idea that Judge, Deliverer, and Saviour, are synonymous terms in the Old Testament; x. 25, "the day" again; ver. 37, "He shall come;" xii. 28, the immoveable kingdom. And so on through all. James i. 12, the "crown;" ii. 5, the "kingdom;" ver. 13, "judgment;" v. 7—9, "the coming of the Lord," twice repeated; and "the Judge" at the door. 1 Pet. i. ver. 1—3, the "hope;" 4, "inheritance;" 5, "salvation *to be* revealed;" 7, the "appearing;" 11, "the glory;" 13, the "revelation," (apocalypse); iv. 5, the judgment of quick and dead; 7, "end of all things" that offend; 13, "glory;" 17, judgment begins at house of God; v. 1, "glory that shall be revealed;" 4, "crown of glory;" 10, "eternal glory." 2 Pet. i. 3, "glory" again; ver. 11, "kingdom;" ii. 9, "day of judgment;" iii. 7—13, the promise of new heavens and earth. Compare carefully the passage quoted, viz., Isa. lxv. 17, and lxvi. 22. Observe, the apostle names three heavens and three earths. To complete this hasty outline, see 1 John ii. 28, the "appearing," the coming; iii. 1—3, the glory to be revealed in us; and iv. 17, "the day of judgment." Jude 14, 15, the coming, the judgment; and ver. 21, mercy, and 24, "presence of His glory with eternal joy."

It was in my heart when I began this paper to have been more diffuse, both regarding these epistles and the book of the Revelation; but I feel now, that if the reader has turned up all the passages quoted, and read them carefully, he will be in no mood for arguments, conclusions, and all the usual phrases of debate; and, therefore, I finish this sketch or list of texts in the same way that we have been running through the other epistles. Rev. i. 7, "Behold he cometh;" ii. 7, "Paradise;" ver. 10, "crown of life;" ver. 26, "power over the nations;" iii. 21, "the fellowship of the throne of judgment" (as 2 Sam. vii. 13; viii. 15; 1 Kings vii. 7; Isaiah

Digitized by Google

ix. 7; xxxii. 1, &c.); v. 10, "kings and priests," "reign on the earth;" vi. 10, "how long dost thou not judge?" ver. 17, "the great day.... is come;" xi. 15, "the kingdoms are become (the property) of our Lord," "he shall reign for ever and ever;" ver. 18, "time come," judgment (*i.e.*, deliverance and victory given to the saints over all foes, death the last); xv. 3, 4, song of Moses and the Lamb, "judgments manifest;" xvi. 14, "great day;" ver. 15, "Behold I come;" xvii. 14, war, conflict, victory of Lamb, "King of kings, Lord of lords;" again, xix. 11, the coming one "faithful and true, who in righteousness doth judge and make war" (comp. Judges iii. 10), and, in short, all the chapter; xx. 4, being the consummation of all, the living again of the martyred saints, the thrones, the judgment "*given unto them*," the reigning "with Christ a thousand years" in a particular state or condition of things on earth; but when that is changed they reign still, even for ever and ever with Christ. Amen! Come, Lord Jesus! Thy kingdom come! Amen.*

* In connexion with the preceding paper, it might be well to arrange the leading truths in order, as heads of doctrine regarding the scriptural hope of judgment to come.

1. The present dispensation is foretold to end in apostasy and judgment.
2. This judgment is to be introduced by the personal appearing of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven.
3. Up to this time of his coming again, the Church shall be oppressed and persecuted as he himself was.
4. Especially as that day draws near the troubles and perils of the faithful followers of the Lamb shall be increased, and they shall be called to sore suffering and martyrdom, for which time God will give them special strength and comfort of his Spirit.
5. The deliverance of the oppressed Church from all her enemies, and the introduction of the reign of peace and righteousness and joy, is not to be expected before the coming of the Lord Jesus.
6. The resurrection of the sleeping members of the body of Christ and the changing of the living ones, and the consequent blessedness of all, are promised in connexion with the same event.
7. The restoration of the Jews to their own land, and the fulfilment of all the prophecies *regarding them*, depend upon the appearing of the Lord to execute the judgment spoken of in all Scripture.
8. This work of judgment is not a work of a few hours or days only, but stretches throughout all the ages to come.
9. The casting of Satan into prison, the destruction of Babylon and Antichrist, &c., all depend on the same glorious hope, viz., the personal appearing of the Lord to judgment.
10. The earth, then freed from the curse and filled with the glory of the Lord, shall be the kingdom of the Son of man.
11. The judgment of the *quick* is a distinct thing and *work* from the judgment of the *dead*.

Digitized by Google

Art. IV.—THE CHURCH SAVED BY HOPE.*

It has been remarked by Richard Cecil, that "perhaps it is a greater energy of Divine power which keeps the Christian from day to day, from year to year,—praying, hoping, running, believing—against all hinderances—which maintains him as a LIVING *martyr*,—than that which bears him up for an hour in sacrificing himself at the stake."

At the starting-point of this living martyrdom, the Christian finds himself a "worm." "Taking hold," however, on God, the "worm" becomes almighty. "By means of his (*continued*) infirmities, the power of Christ is made to *rest* upon him:" and, strengthened by that power, he "can do all things." Such is the import of the word "*saved*," employed by the apostle in the divine affirmation standing at the head of this article. It holds up to our view the living martyr, accomplishing his course by one unbroken communication to him of the "exceeding greatness" of God's might.

But in "saving" the living martyr, God uses a certain *instrumentality*. The instrumentality consists of certain *motives*. These motives vary in their intensity of force,—some being more diagonal and others more direct. Of them all, no one approaches, in its impulsive power, to the motive specified in the same divine affirmation. That motive is "HOPE." We are saved by hope.

And on what *object* is the "hope" of the living martyr set? It is declared in the word, broadly and emphatically, to be "*the glorious appearing*" *of his Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*. (Titus ii. 13.) Our purpose in the present article is, briefly to indicate what seems to be God's own *rationale* of this "blessed hope." We carry along with us our living martyr. In *his* presence the question rises from the paltriness of a mere thing of casuistry, or of curious or pleasant speculation, into the magnitude of a theme which constitutes the martyr's *daily food*. Lying low in the dust, and avoiding all "excellency of speech and of wisdom," we draw near to "the excellent glory." We ask and expect such a revelation of the divine secrets as the living martyr *needs*.

On *what ground*, then, is it that *the Lord's appearing* is set forth in the Bible as *the Church's hope?* Not, certainly, as a mere isolated fact (however blessed in itself that fact be), but

* "*We are saved by hope.*" (Rom. viii. 24.)

Digitized by Google

as a grand central fact, around which there clusters an entire system of divine developments dear to every Christian heart.

Take, for example, that most perfectly moulded of all hearts—that heart wherein alone dwells the Spirit without measure—*the heart of God's "holy child Jesus."* On what do we find *that heart* mainly set at each of the successive intervals when its throbbings are revealed? A single brief chain of passages will enable us to decide. (1.) We fix our eye on that wondrous family-scene pourtrayed in the 8th chapter of Proverbs. The "holy child"—the elder brother of the blood-washed circle of a later day—is seen beside his Father, his soul rejoicing in the prospect of some signal manifestation of his Father's glory, to be enacted on this "habitable earth." (2.) In the 2d Psalm, where another glimpse of the scene is opened, we overhear a communing. In view of the earth's revolting rebelliousness, the Father, turning complacently to his "holy child," whom he has "made strong for himself," exclaims, "Yet have I set *my* King upon my holy hill of Sion." And what is *the Son's response?* An instant announcement of *his heart's intensest sympathy,*—"I will declare the decree;" declare, by a translation, not into word, but into fact: the zeal of his Father's house consumes him; he cannot rest until, as his Father's King, he reigns over "earth," breaking with a rod of iron all its potsherd "kings." (3.) In Rev. ii. 25—27, where the scene is again unveiled, the words of the 2d Psalm being expressly quoted, the Father's King, now alone, is seen hastening forward, as it were, with fresh devotedness to *the era,* when the "decree" shall be "*declared:*" only, *now* the era is *more expressly defined;* it is the era to be *ushered in by his second advent;* "Hold fast," he says, "*till I come;* and he that overcometh," &c., (the believer's share with him in the regal prerogative we do not notice, as it is a mere accident of the scene, suggested by the occasion, and is beside our present purpose). (4.) Passing on to Rev. xxi. 3, the Father's King, no longer walking among the candlesticks, is seen *arrived* in glory *on the "habitable earth,"* "a great voice out of heaven" proclaiming, "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men:" and *no sooner is he come, than instantly there commences the longed-for era,* "He that sat upon the throne," saying, "Behold, I make all things new." The details of the era have just been announced in the preceding chapters. In the passage before us, these details are summed up under the general appellative of a renewal, or "making all

Digitized by Google

things new." And, as if to banish all doubt as to the peculiar character of the era as *the era of the Lord's personal and literal presence*, the *introductory scene* is stated, we repeat, to be *the descent of the Lord's tabernacle*—that tabernacle of God (σκηνὴ του Θεοῦ), "the man Christ Jesus," which, *erected* on the day that "the Word was made flesh and dwelt (tabernacled, ἐσκηνωσε) among us," *taken down* on Calvary, *re-erected* at the grave on the morning of the third day, "*handled*" by the disciples during the forty days, and *taken up* in their sight into heaven, was announced to *come again* in like manner as he had ascended. So that here we have the *season of the execution of that "sure decree"* which from eternity had been the secret of the "holy child's" unutterable gladness *identified palpably with his Second Advent*,—no previous millennium of godliness and loyalty—nothing which can in any way satisfy the Son's longings, being for an instant supposed,—and further and especially, no room being left for the hypothesis, that the "renewal" here emerging is the result, not of a literal coming of Jesus, but simply of an extraordinary outpouring of the *Spirit*, inasmuch as the tabernacle now announced to be translated to earth, and to be God's immediate residence as he thus dwells *amongst* men, cannot possibly refer to any other person of the Godhead save the second (or, the Incarnate—the "flesh" being "the true tabernacle, which God pitched, and not man"). And, accordingly, the *Advent* having now passed into the *watchword of the era*, the "holy child" is seen at the revelation's close, "hasting" to *this day of his appearing;* indeed, *hasting*, for in the 22d chapter, not once, or twice, but three several times, whilst again announcing (at ver. 10) the "*time*," or season of the renewing (ὁ καιρὸς), to be "at hand," there issue from his lips the emphatic words, "I COME QUICKLY." (5.) And on the *same grand era* his heart is fixed *still*. "Father," he cries, as we learn from the intercessory prayer,—which, as the reader doubtless knows, is designed to be an epitome of his attitude and work during the currency of the present era,—"Father, glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee." In so crying, the "holy child," whilst, no doubt, intent on the ingathering and sanctifying work of the existing introductory scene as the first-fruits of the "glorifying," *mainly* has in view the anticipated joy of the *harvest-home*—those "times," on the one hand, of "refreshing," and on the other, of wrathful recompense, which, so soon as "the heavens" have ceased to "receive" him or be his dwelling-place, he shall be "sent" forth to introduce,—that era when,

Digitized by Google

glorified as the Son in taking full possession of the kingdom, and his Father glorified in receiving at his hand the kingdom thus prepared, he shall forget, in the mirth of the harvest-home, the "weeping," the "strong crying and tears" of the sowing. (6.) And, as if to assure the Church that her living Head has *not* "*hoped*" all the while *in vain*, the "holy child" is, by an *anticipatory glimpse* in Isaiah lxiii., exhibited as already far advanced in the *actual realities* of the *Advent era*. "Who is this," exclaims the prophet, as he descries, coming from Edom, a mysterious personage, "red in his apparel?" "I that speak in righteousness," is the reply, "mighty to save." It is no other than *the* "*holy child*" *amid the glories of his second coming*,—the "red apparel" being plainly the "vesture dipped in blood" of Rev. xix. 13. The prophet, not yet understanding the strange scene, inquires what is his errand. The answer announces the *characteristics of the era*—those characteristics which so long have rendered it the grand object of his "hope." "The day of vengeance," he says, "is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come." The year of his redeemed—the millenary season of their triumphant reign is *come*, is *set in*, and he is "glorified in them;" not by, but "*in* them," they being, as it were, a mirror wherein is reflected his glory as the Father's King. And another end of his Advent, judgment on his Father's enemies, he is now just about to execute; to that he hastens forward, "upheld" by his "fury," by his burning zeal for his Father's glory (for his Father "delights," not only in "loving-kindness," but in "judgment and righteousness," Jer. ix. 24),—"I will tread down the people in mine anger;" "the day of vengeance is in mine heart."

Such is the *object* on which the "*hope*" of the "*holy child*" has been uninterruptedly set. *And how did the hope bear on* HIS *living martyrdom?* "For the joy that was set before him," we read, "he endured the cross, despising the shame." The *cross*—that grand crisis of the midnight-gloom of his earthly course—that key-stone of the arch spanning the dark chasm to be passed over ere he could be "made perfect," could be personally accoutred as his Father's King—that cross he endured, not with submission merely, but with delight, at the bidding of *one master-motive*. The motive was "*the joy set before him.*" And *what* "*joy?*" The joy of carrying out his Father's will in obtaining for him the kingdom. At his ascension the "joy" was adumbrated. Having overcome, he "was set down at the right hand of his

Digitized by Google

Father's throne,"—was formally inaugurated as his Father's King. But the *fulfilling* of the "joy" was to be the work of *another era;* for, though seated at the right hand of God, he is represented as still in an "*expecting*" posture. (Heb. x. 12, 13.) The era for which he thus waits is *the era of his personal and literal reign.* Into the reason why the Son's literal presence on earth is made essential to the fulfilling of "the joy" we do not presume to inquire. Others have pronounced dogmatically on this theme, rejecting, almost contemptuously rejecting, such a mode of fulfilling "the joy" as incompatible with what *they* deem to befit at once the honour of the Spirit and the majesty of the glorified Immanuel. We decline to descend into the *à priori* arena: it is no fitting field for the humble disciple of the Lamb. What *God* has *said* he *will* do, not what we *fancy* he *ought* to do, is *our* court of first and of last appeal. Sitting as little children at Jehovah's feet, we hear (as we judge) the announcement that on the "holy child's" "appearing" is suspended, as on its grand central fact, the fulfilling of his "joy." Hence it is that *his* "*appearing*" has been throughout the *object of his intensest longing.* For the "joy," of which that appearing is the symbol, the "holy child" humbled himself, suffered, groaned, died. *His* was indeed a living martyrdom; and the living martyr was "saved by hope."

Each *member* of the body is "saved" by the *same* "hope" as the living *Head.* Both are animated by the prospect of the same "joy." Both suspend the realisation of the joy on the same grand central fact.

For what is the *main source* of the *living martyr's tribulation?* Is it any mere personal suffering—any mere affliction of self? So grovels the earth-born Christian. But the heaven-born, Spirit-taught Christian rises to a higher tone. The source of *his* tribulation is, the *dishonour done to his Father*—done in his own heart—done in the Church—done in an ungodly world around him. Mark that portrait of him sketched in Ezek. ix. 4. What feature of character is specified as the distinctive mark of the martyr-remnant? "Sighing and crying for the abominations done in the midst." The cry at once identifies them as the "brethren" of Him who testified to the source of *his* tribulation, saying, "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up." And though theirs was only as the smoking flax compared with the burning flame which consumed the elder brother, still it was the same heavenly fire kindled by the one Spirit.

And what is the *remedy* for *this tribulation?* Is it death?

Digitized by Google

Is it the mere cessation of personal trial? That, indeed, is not excluded. But something above and beyond that is needed to satisfy the longing. The only exact correlative or counterpart of the tribulation is the *full and final vindication of the Father's honour*. What a striking illustration of this have we in Rev. vi. 10! The passage opens up a glimpse of the heart of the redeemed in their *intermediate* state. The strictly personal conflict is over. The living martyr is a martyr no longer. The evil heart of unbelief, which used to try him so grievously, has ceased to occasion one instant's withdrawal of God's face. He is now uninterruptedly "with Christ;" and so the "sighing" is conclusively over, even as is the sighing of the elder Brother. This is truly "far better." But *a longing still remains*, and a longing all the intenser now that the earthly drag is gone. Earth is yet the scene of a hideous revolt; vengeance on the blood-shedders is yet unexecuted; the "sons of God" are not yet "manifested;" the Father's King is yet unglorified. No wonder, then, there ascends from "under the altar" the cry—the loud, earnest, incessant cry,—"How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" Another link, and the anticipated "joy" of these "souls" is *identified* with the *Second Advent*. The passage before us, it will be noticed, simply touches (ver. 11) on the interval still to elapse, bidding them "rest" in quietness till that brief interval expire, for it is not yet "filled up." (See Scholz, who reads πληρωσωσι, which seems preferable.) But elsewhere the link is supplied. In the touching parable of the importunate widow and the unjust judge (Luke xviii. 1—8), the scene "under the altar" is manifestly in the Lord's eye. "Hear," said Jesus,—and the words reveal his own heart's thoroughest sympathy with the cry,—"hear what the unjust judge saith: And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them" (or rather, though he "linger long" in regard to them—the "lingering" arising from unwillingness to execute the just doom, from a desire to keep the door open a little longer, as in 2 Pet. iii. 15, where the same Greek word occurs). "I tell you that he will avenge them speedily." And *what* is the "*speedily?*" It is the "*quickly*" of Rev. xxii. 20. It is *the coming of the Son of man.*

Thus the *Christian* (the divinely-fashioned Christian) is at once in his trial and in his hope a *transcript*,—faintly enough deciphered, no doubt,—of *the pattern, Christ Jesus.* He who was "tempted in all things even as we are," who "bore our griefs and carried our sorrows," realized too vividly the

Digitized by Google

value of *his* hope, and sympathized too intensely with his struggling "brethren"—to leave the divine secret unveiled or unurged. A *like heavenly course* can be sustained only by a *like heavenly hope*. Knowing well the invariableness of the sequence, he has laboured—anxiously laboured—to link the two terms so closely that whoso runs may read. Take two illustrative specimens. (1.) The first is in Rev. iii. 21. It is the closing appeal to the faithful remnant in the last of the seven churches. "To him that overcometh," says he, "will I grant to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." The words are unspeakably touching. Fresh, as it were, from his own martyr-ordeal, and tenderly regarding the "little flock" whom he has left behind him in an unfriendly world, as well as all "them also who should believe on him through their word," he cannot but point them to the same "light" (2 Pet. i. 19) on which his own eye was set whilst he traversed the "dark place." The light which gilded his horizon we have already analyzed. The light which must gild theirs is identical. It is the hoped-for dawn and glory of "that day." (2.) The second specimen is in Heb. xii. 1—2. Paul is dealing with the *realities* of the *living martyr's course;* he wants to stimulate his own and his fellow-martyrs' afflicted, tempest-tossed souls to earnestness and patient endurance. What is the *motive* at once suggested? No other than "that *blessed hope*." And to make the argument palpable, he *appeals* to the *pattern*—the pattern of him "who, for the joy set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." *His* "joy" we have already seen to be centred on the era of his Second Coming, inasmuch as only in the multiform work of that era shall he be fully glorified as his Father's King. The "joy" of those who "look unto Jesus" as their pattern, must of course be *centred* on the *same blessed era, not* on death or any event short of that era. So the latter "joy" is *expressly defined* by the apostle *elsewhere*. In 2 Tim. iv. 6—8, we find him personally at the very close of his course: "The time of my departure," says he, "is at hand; I have fought a good fight" (*the* good fight, literally;—it is the identical idea of Heb. xii. 1, the word rendered "race" there and "fight" here being the same word); "I have finished my course; I have kept the faith." And what remains? The *fulfilling* of his joy—the receiving of his crown. But when is the coronation era? Not at his departure, now impending so imminently. No, he overleaps that event; and he overleaps,

Digitized by Google

moreover, the parenthesis—be it the parenthesis of a year, or of a century, or of twenty centuries—which divides him from another era, the *era* of *his Master's Advent.* It is on "*that day*" that the crown shall be given: it is on "that day" that the Father's King shall be completely glorified in associating all who have "overcome" into actual fellowship with himself in his throne and in his power over the nations. And so, in counselling the living martyr to "look unto Jesus," as he hastens and struggles on in his course, he virtually counsels him to wait for "that day"—to "love" (even as Jesus loves) "his appearing."

Such we apprehend to be the true *rationale* of this "blessed hope." To some the argument may seem impalpable and transcendental,—*too remote from self*, and, therefore, *too feeble* to be of value as a *motive-power.* Brainerd tells of a period in his life when *he* would have so pronounced upon such a hope: it was a period outwardly of many duties, many strivings, many prayers; but its inner history is written by himself at an after-season thus:—"I used to charge my duties with sin and imperfection; but this was only on account of the wanderings and vain thoughts attending them, and not because I had no regard to God in them; for this I thought I had. But when I saw evidently that I had regard to nothing but self-interest, then they appeared a vile mockery of God, self-worship, and a continual course of lies." Brainerd, however, lived to be another man: he was "born again;" he was "renewed in the spirit of his mind." And what is his inner history now? "There opened to my soul," he writes, "a new inward apprehension or view of *God,* such as I never had before, nor anything which had the least resemblance of it. . . . . My soul rejoiced with joy unspeakable, to see such a God, such a glorious Divine being; and I was inwardly pleased and satisfied that he should be *God over all* for ever and ever. . . . . Thus God, I trust, brought me to a hearty disposition to *exalt him* and set *him* on the throne, and *principally and ultimately to aim at his honour and glory as King of the universe.*" What a talisman to *such* a man is the "hope" of an era, when this God shall take the kingdom and reign "all in all!" To Brainerd, the prosperous professor, what hope more vapid or intangible! To Brainerd, the Spirit-led Christian, it is the very pole-star of his course. That the Lord's "appearing" is introductory to the era elevates that "appearing" into the watchword of the Church's "hope."

Digitized by Google

A recent traveller has recorded a scene which he witnessed near Geneva, when, one misty morning in autumn, he ascended the mountain range of the Grand Saléve, and, after climbing the rocky zigzag in the face of the mountain amidst a fog so impenetrable that he could see nothing and feel nothing besides, suddenly his head rose above the level of the fog into the clear air, and into the broad dazzling sunshine thrown back from the face of Mont Blanc and the vast range of snow-clad mountains. "No language," writes the traveller, "could describe the extraordinary sublimity and beauty of the view." An ocean of mist, as smooth as a chalcedony, lay over the whole lower world. Standing on the overhanging crags, he could hear the chime of bells, the hum of busy labour, and the lowing of cattle buried in the mist, and faintly coming up to him from the fields and villages. "When you go down into the mist again," he adds, "and leave behind you the beautiful sky, a clear bracing atmosphere, the bright sun, and the snow-shining mountains, it is like passing from heaven to earth, from the brightness and serenity of the one to the darkness and cares of the other." It is one who has visited *such a scene* in the *spiritual world*,—one who has ascended (it may be, toilsomely) from amidst the fogs of this lower earth into those "heavenlies," where it is his privilege to behold the glories of the Lamb "standing in the midst of the throne,"—it is such a man who, though still locally a dweller in the mist, is found expressing, in the passage from which the motto of our article is taken (Rom. viii.), the *hope* and *longing expectation* befitting a child of the mountain sunshine. The scene *immediately around* is indeed *very dark*. There are "the deeds of the body" (ver. 13), demanding crucifixion; there are "the sufferings of this present time," or season (ver. 18), inflicted by an ungodly world; there is "the bondage of corruption" (ver. 21); there is "the whole creation groaning and travailing in pain together" (ver. 22): not only so, there is even he who "has the first-fruits of the Spirit" "groaning within himself" (ver. 23). But dark as the scene is below, it is *all brightness on the mountain*. There is "the glory" (ver. 18) *behind* the mist. The "manifestation of the sons of God," the "redemption of the body," the release of "the creature" from "vanity," and of "the whole creation" from that crushing load of ungodliness under which it "groans,"—these are the elements of "the glory." That glory is already (to *his* eye) spread out in bright perspective away in the mountain-scene. A brief hour or two, and the lifting of the misty curtain shall reveal it in all its gladdening brilliancy.

Digitized by Google

Knowing this, the man, meanwhile, is of good courage. He is sorely harassed, it is true; he groans within himself, he is a living martyr; but he rejoices notwithstanding, he waits for the redemption, he looks for that blessed hope. "We are saved," writes the apostle, "by hope."

"But may not I," inquires some earnest man, (for only with such, not with the mere cavilling disputant, have we any dealing in this argument) "*may not I cherish, and be sustained by, this 'hope,' though rejecting the doctrine of the premillennial Advent?*"

We go to *the Word.* Let the Holy Ghost be heard. In the chapter before us, the reader will remark, *two prominent objects* are specified, whereon the "hope" in question is set, viz., 1. "The redemption of the body;" and 2. The redemption of "the creation." The "*hope*" must, of course, derive its distinctive *shape and form* from the *mode* in which this *twofold redemption* is expected to be attained. If it shall appear that *this mode* is no other than the *Lord's personal Advent,* the "*hope*" and the *Advent* must become *indissolubly linked.* Now, has *the Lord spoken* decisively respecting the *mode* and *season* of the "*redemption?*" We think he has, though we can afford only a passing illustration.

1. "*The redemption of the body.*" This object of the believer's hope is more comprehensive than at first sight it might seem. It is the indispensable preliminary to his coming reign. In what way? At the Fall, the body fell under the curse, being handed over to Satan as the executioner of God's righteous sentence. In virtue of Christ's work the curse is lifted off: the body, as well as the soul, of each saint is, by right, his: as "He that was dead and is alive," He holds "the keys of death." But though holding the keys (and himself risen as "the first-fruits"), He has not yet opened the prison-house: "the *redemption*" is *not yet* an *accomplished fact.* And till the body is "redeemed," the saint is not glorified, nor is Christ fully glorified in him. Now what is the *mode* of deliverance and its season? Not death, common as it is to hear the saint's dissolution so regarded. Paul expressly disallows such a theory. "We that are in this tabernacle" (he says, 2 Cor. v. 4) "do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed,"—*that* (viz., death) were but a small deliverance comparatively, relieve him though it would from the "law in his members" warring against the law of his mind,—"but clothed upon," —*i.e.*, clothed with the spiritual body: and why?—"that

Digitized by Google

mortality may be swallowed up of life,"—in other words, that Christ may become, not by right only, but in fact, entire conqueror over death. The idea is fully evolved in 1 Cor. xv. The "clothing upon" there opens up in full glory. The apostle feels as if translated, for the moment, to the very scene. The saints already "asleep" are seen emerging from their chrysalis retirement into the adornment of the "incorruptible;" whilst the saints not yet "asleep" are, "in the twinkling of an eye," "changed" into the same "incorruptible." Blessed consummation! "O death!" exclaims the apostle, as by faith he beholds the wondrous spectacle, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" And, as he sings, there stands before him *the person of Immanuel* (for, at ver. 23, *He* is expressly said to be "come"),—his foot planted on the neck of "the last enemy,"—in his hand the key of the now opened prison-house (opened as regards all the saints thus partaking in "the first resurrection"),—whilst there beams in his face a complacency unutterable as, with the saints now around Him, He lifts his eye towards his Father, because *now at length is "brought to pass* the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." We turn next to the passage (Isa. xxv.) where "the saying" thus "brought to pass" is "written," and what do we find? Why, the *millennial jubilee;* for such is the interpretation universally, we believe, put upon the passage. And what are the *characteristics of the jubilee?* An event has occurred, of which the only description here given is, that "death is swallowed up in victory." (Ver. 8.) What is that event? A spiritual revival, say some; a resurrection of souls, a Pentecostal effusion of the Spirit.* No, saith the Holy Ghost expressly, in this passage in 1 Cor. xv.; it is the *saints' literal resurrection*, it is the mortal putting on immortality, it is the long-looked-for "redemption of the body." And, of course, *this* implies *another characteristic of the jubilee* to be the *Lord's personal presence.* Such we might gather to be the import of the song of the happy saints in that day (ver. 9),—"Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him," &c.; although, if the inference were denied, and the

* We refer here more especially to the Rev. David Brown (in his work on the Advent), who, differing here, as on many other occasions, from almost all preceding commentators, denies the applicability of this passage to the resurrection at all. Fully alive to the cogency of the argument furnished by it in favour of a premillennial Advent if only the general purport of the passage be admitted to have reference to the resurrection, he cuts the Gordian knot by ejecting the resurrection from the passage altogether.

Digitized by Google

presence affirmed to be simply the presence of God (on an unusual scale) by his Spirit, we should not, from the mere tenor of the song, press for an admission of a premillennial personal Advent. But here again the Divine testimony, in the parallel passage, is positive and express. The *era* has been *introduced* (1 Cor. xv. 23) by the *arrival of the man Christ Jesus*. It is *He* who has "swallowed up death in victory," who has "wiped away tears from all faces."*

2. *The redemption of the Creation* is the other prominent object specified (in Rom. viii.), on which the "hope" of the Church is set. This is termed in Eph. i. 14, "the *redemption* of the *purchased possession*." Here also, as in the redemption of the body, a larger scene is embraced than the first glance might indicate. At the Fall, the earth, as well as the body, partook of the curse. Appalling curse! Not only was the ground cursed, but "the strong man, armed," took possession of its living inhabitants. The usurper became its god, and benighted man became at once his adorer and his slave. "All these things," said the prince on a memorable occasion, "will *I give* thee." But, by "the sure decree," it had long since passed out of his hands. It was given in covenant to the Son of man; Christ has paid the stipulated purchase-money; now it is *his by right*, as his Father's King. The "possession," however, though "purchased," is *not yet delivered*, or "*redeemed*." It still is under bondage; "the whole creation still groaneth." Its laws and its governments and its people still symbolize with the Apostate. Nothing is more trying to the believer than this. It grieves him to the heart to see his Father thus disowned, and the Son, who is its rightful King, set at nought. But he knows it shall not be always so. *Another and a brighter era is at hand*. In the hope of that era, he lifts up his head, knowing that his "redemption draweth nigh."

Now the question is, *How is this era introduced?* A single illustration will answer the question. In Isa. lxv. the renewing of the earth is announced. A scene is pictured, precisely the counterpart of the scene over which the Church now groans. We have the millennial glory, with its variegated wonders of a restored Jerusalem, a rejoicing Israel, a multi-

* How exactly does this whole scene, especially as given in 1 Cor. xv., harmonize with the particular detail of the millennium as presented in Rev. xx.! All the persons who rise "at Christ's coming" are said (1 Cor. xv. 23) to be *Christ's;* and all then raised are raised to glory. (Vers. 42—54.) This is "the *first* resurrection" of Rev. xx. The others —"the rest of the dead"—are raised and disposed of at an after-period of the era.

Digitized by Google

tudinous assemblage of risen saints, and a generation (perhaps successive generations) of new converts. And in the *foreground* of the picture we have *a renovated earth*,—"Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth" (ver. 17),—a renovation, not spiritual, but *literal*,—a fact settled unmistakeably by the Holy Ghost in 2 Pet. iii., where this very promise is quoted (ver. 13) and explained, and where the mode of renovation is stated to be a baptism by fire, even as at the Deluge "the heavens and the earth, which then were," had been baptized by water, the latter being a mere rehearsal, though on a scale less grand by far, of the former. But *the Divine Worker*, so prominent in the scene,—rejoicing so gladsomely in his workmanship, whilst He stamps it so emphatically to be his, "Behold, I create" (Isa. lxv. 17),—and, as if all the tears and groans of the creation and of the Church were at the instant concentred in his sympathetic heart, adding the consolatory words, "and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind" (for so sore had been the burden, that even the very memory of it might, through a fear of its possible return, throw a shade over the joy), "but be ye glad, and rejoice for ever in that which I create," —*Who is this?* Not the Spirit, but the now "revealed" *Immanuel*. So affirms the Scripture in the above passage of Peter's Second Epistle. *Christ himself is personally come.* To *that glorious event* the *earth's redemption* is there inseparably *joined;* and though the redemption goes on progressively, it being only at the end of the era that the usurper-chieftain (though previously chained during the millennium) is finally overthrown, and all his agents, whether devils or men, are cast into the lake of fire;* yet

* It is the manner of the Holy Spirit, in speaking of the Advent era, to select, on *each* particular occasion, that *special feature* of it which is suited to the *practical* end in hand. For example, the feature of *judgment* is selected *here*, inasmuch as that is the feature *specially fitted* to *awe the "scoffers"* with whom (vers. 3, 4) He is dealing. Again, when He would *comfort bereaved Christians* concerning those who "have fallen asleep" (as in 1 Thess. v. 13—18), He adduces as his consolation *another feature* of the *Advent era*, not less *suited* to *this* occasion, viz., that when Jesus comes "the dead in Christ shall rise first," and, joining those "which are alive and remain," shall together meet a descending Lord and be ever with Him. Or further; when the *object* is to *urge on man the acceptance of the Son*, a constraining *motive* is drawn from yet *another* special *feature* of the *Advent era*, viz., that there then awaiteth men, according as they shall now receive or reject the Son, a "resurrection unto life," or a "resurrection of damnation." (John v. 23—28.) If this manner of the Spirit were kept in view, it would save from much misinterpretation of the word; *e.g.*, because in this passage last quoted the two resurrections are, for the purpose just stated, brought into close

Digitized by Google

the instant the Lord "appears," the era is commenced, and earth is virtually his: the shout of "a king" is in the Church's midst,—*He* "rejoicing over them with joy, resting in his love, joying over them with singing" (Zeph. iii. 17),—and *they*, as each in succession sweeps the strings of his golden harp, exclaiming, "I will sing unto the Lord as long as I live; I will sing praise to my God while I have any being. . . . . Let the sinners be consumed out of *the earth*, and let the wicked be no more. Bless thou the Lord, O my soul: praise ye the Lord." (Ps. civ. 33—35.)

Thus the twofold redemption—of the body and of the earth—is seen to be *introduced* by the *Second Advent* of Him who "of God is made unto us," not only "wisdom and righteousness and sanctification," but also, and emphatically, "*redemption.*" But *till* this twofold redemption be *accomplished*, the Church is represented (Rom. viii.) as *still groaning*, longing, hoping; so that *if the Lord's coming be postponed until after the millennium, the groaning of the Church, as well as the groaning of the Creation, continues unabated almost, throughout that long and blissful jubilee.* We see no way of avoiding this conclusion. Either the twofold redemption must be accomplished without the Lord's personal presence—a position which none, we think, will, in the face of such passages as those quoted, venture to maintain; or else, during the entire millennium, there shall be heard on this earth no other music save the "groaning" of a burdened Church and of a burdened creation, waiting for the "redemption" at its close. Let either horn of the dilemma be selected,* we are unable to discover any method of escape from the one or the other, except by admitting the Premillennial Advent. That, however, makes all plain; and that, moreover, gives its comforting and stimulating cogency to the "hope" by which the Church is "saved." For can it be doubted that a hope *so* founded is a hope more constrain-

conjunction, has it not been inferred that the passage was intended to teach that the two are really close together *in point of time*, whereas the passage is plainly not designed to give any deliverance on *that point* at all? We must go in quest of *details* to those passages where the details are *intended* to be taught; it is sufficient, in regard to the others, that the incidental mention of details is not in dissonance with the general plan expressly laid down elsewhere.

* Mr. Brown, in his work on the Advent, does not shrink from laying hold of the *latter* horn of the dilemma, and is at great pains to shear of almost all its glories the millennial jubilee; so much so, that when the jubilee comes out of his merciless gripe, it has ceased to be a jubilee at all.

Digitized by Google

ing by far than a hope which looks away into the dim distance of a post-millennial era? The latter hope may not be without its own power; but if the Holy Ghost have furnished a better and a mightier, is the race so easy, the conflict so slight, the martyrdom so insignificant, that the Christian can afford to rest contented with the less excellent way?

But whence, we cannot but ask our still incredulous friend, *whence this strange unwillingness to admit a premillennial personal* Advent as the basis of the Church's "hope?" Mr. Coleridge, in his "Aids to Reflection," speaks of "the practice of certain persons to *explain away* positive assertions of Scripture on the pretext that the *literal sense* is not agreeable to reason,—that is, THEIR *particular* reason. And inasmuch as, in the only right sense of the word, there is no such thing as a *particular* reason, they must, and in fact they *do*, mean that the literal sense is not accordant to their *understanding*, *i.e.*, to the notions which their understandings have been taught and accustomed to form in their School of Philosophy." (Page 365.) Does this, we solemnly and affectionately demand, furnish no key to the prejudice shared by you with so many against the doctrine in question? There lately went from among us an illustrious man, whose childlike simplicity of character lifted him above the littleness of obstinately maintaining his old ground, simply because it had been *his*. CHALMERS was no committed disciple of the Premillenarian School; his whole earlier writings, as the reader probably knows—(though repeatedly urging the doctrine of a *material* heaven, in opposition to the spiritual sentimentalism of those who shrink from the very thought of materialism, even a renovated materialism, as if contaminating by its mere touch; and though not less repeatedly urging the doctrine of a millennium ushered in by sore and signal judgments, in opposition to the unscriptural, though doubtless amiable, fancies which used to be propounded from missionary platforms, as if the prospect before the Church were one continuous diffusion of living Christianity over the earth, until we should be gradually and pleasantly, and almost insensibly, landed in a spiritual millennium),—are void of any avowal of a belief in a millennium introduced and conducted by a literally present Saviour. Yet, towards the close of his days, and in the mellowed ripeness of a matured spiritual judgment, we find him writing thus—(we quote from the third volume of his "Post-

Digitized by Google

humous Works:")—"There has been no appearance yet from Sion," says he, commenting on the remarkable language of the fiftieth Psalm, "at all corresponding with that made from Mount Sinai. And I am far more inclined to the literal interpretation of this Psalm than to that which would restrict it to the mere preaching of the Gospel in the days of the apostles. It looks far more like *the descent of the Son of man on the Mount of Olives*, with all the *accompaniments* of a *Jewish conversion* and a *first resurrection*, and a *destruction of the assembled hosts of Antichrist*. The saints here summoned are those within the pale of the everlasting covenant, ratified by the blood of the sacrifice of Christ. The address here given is like that from the Son of God, now manifested to the Jews, who had returned, though yet unconverted, to the Holy Land; but who, now hearing the words as well as seeing the person of Him whom they had pierced, are born in a day by the impressive remonstrance and overpowering spectacle." Again, on Isa. xxiv., he writes:—"In this prophecy is foreshewn a visitation upon the earth still future, which is to emerge in the millennium—how emphatically told in this place!—when the Lord shall reign in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." And on Isa. xxv.:—"In Mount Sion, now the metropolis of the Christian world, shall there be a great spiritual feast for all people." And on verse 8,—"Can this be, that in the millennium there will be no death? Surely, they who partake in the first resurrection will not die over again." And on Isa. lxv.:—"We cannot think, of those who have part in the first resurrection that they will again die. But will none of the righteous die? And if not, what is meant by 'the child dying a hundred years old,' and in contrast with the sinner who, though he should live a hundred years, will be accursed? We doubt not that there will be *two contemporaneous societies* at that period—the righteous, and the wicked who are without, and will not be permitted to hurt or to destroy in all God's holy mountain." And on Isa. lii.:—"It is quite obvious of this prophecy, that it expands beyond the dimension of its typical event, and that it relates, not to a past, but to a future and final deliverance of the Jews. . . . . Their 'seeing eye to eye' makes for the *personal reign* of Him whose feet shall stand upon the Mount of Olives." And, to give just another quotation, he writes on Psa. lxviii.:—"There is every likelihood of allusions here to the great contest of the Book of Revelation. . . . . But God has in reserve for his people still another restoration: He will bring

Digitized by Google

them again, as of old, from Bashan and the Red Sea to their own land. His people will 'see him whom they have pierced,' perhaps when his feet stand on the Mount of Olives, and Jerusalem will again become the great central sanctuary, by becoming the metropolis of the Christian world." Here are *the grand lineaments of the Advent era.* —a renewing of earth, the first resurrection, Israel's glory, a large conversion-work, a judgment at the close, and the whole ushered in and carried forward under the personal presidency of the present and visible God-man. That they are given as gropings, rather than as distinct findings, he himself would have explained by the fact that he had never set himself to digest into systematic order the details of the Prophetic Word. But, rising above the prejudices and fears of lesser men, Chalmers is no sooner summoned by circumstances to give a deliverance on that Word than his sagacious and, withal, child-like soul at once pronounces a plain and common-sense decision, unscared by any previous theories, or by any difficulties of detail which the other may bring in its train. It was like the man. Galileo was content to go to the prison of the Inquisition and into exile, because, true to the Baconian method, he could not, in deference to the received opinion, contradict the plain facts of nature, as observed and certiorated by his own senses. Not less joyfully would Chalmers have endured the crucifixion of a theological outlawry, rather than consent to evade or explain away the plain sayings of the Word.

We traversed lately the land of Israel. (1.) Wandering northward (from Egypt) to Gaza, and nearing the existing town, we beheld on our left, as we advanced, the site of the ancient city, now a huge mound of drifted sand, with only here and there a half-buried marble column, uttering the sad tale of her former splendour. We opened our Bible at Zeph. ii. 4; it had been written, "Gaza shall be forsaken:" and we opened Jer. xlvii. 5; the scene, still far distant, had stood in naked reality before the seer's eye, and he had written,—"Baldness is come upon Gaza." (2.) Sauntering next amongst the few scattered huts of Ashkelon, we again opened Zephaniah (ii. 4—6); and, as if we had been reading a recent history instead of a prophecy written in the days of Philistia's glory, we found Ashkelon indeed become "a desolation," and "the sea-coasts" "dwellings and cottages for shepherds, and folds for flocks." (3.) We then stood on Mount Sion, concerning which it had been written (Jer. xxvi. 18),—"Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Sion shall be

Digitized by Google

ploughed like a field." And we plucked growing barley from its soil. (4.) We entered Jerusalem; we walked along its ruined streets; we worshipped in the outskirt of a building —the English Protestant Church—whose foundation had been sunk not less than fifty feet ere the workmen penetrated to the rock through the prodigious mass of ruins. We turned to the same Word (Jer. xxvi. 18), and found the writing,— "Jerusalem shall become heaps." (5.) We afterwards visited "the coasts of Tyre and Sidon." We had read, on our way, the Divine declaration that, though at the time the grand reservoir of the mercantile navy of the world, Tyre should yet become a place for the "spreading of nets in the midst of the sea" (Ezek. xxvi. 5.): on reaching the present Tyre,—a poor, ruined town, the remnant of the ancient city's sea-port, and almost literally "in the midst of the sea," insomuch that in its leading thoroughfare, lying next the sea, we at one place rode ankle-deep in the rolling wave, —we found only a few fishing-boats, with the men engaged in drying their nets. We had also read, on our way, the solemn doom of the same Tyre (ver. 14),—"I will make thee like the top of a rock . . . . . thou shalt be built no more; for I the Lord have spoken it, saith the Lord God;" and (ver. 21),—"I will make thee a terror, and thou shalt be no more; though thou be sought for, yet shalt thou never be found again, saith the Lord God:" we sought for the once majestic city, but indeed it is "like the top of a rock;" there stretches along the shore, to the extent of two or three miles, a rocky flat, strewn with little fragments of hewn stone and granite columns, but the exact site literally "cannot be found;" the Liverpool of Ezekiel's day literally is no more. (6.) The entire land of Judah, once so pleasant and so fertile, and so radiant with the smiles of a happy people—happy because the Lord was their God, we found now vacant and desolate;—the few Arab strangers who possess it, bearing on their whole mien and mode of life the aspect, not of proprietors or even of settled tenants, but of mere vagrants or passers-by; whilst to the insignificant remnant of Jews in it there seemed to be barely tolerated the melancholy privilege of mourning over the desolation. We opened the Book, and found it written,—"Ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it." (Deut. xxviii. 63.) And again:—"The land shall be utterly emptied, and utterly spoiled: for the Lord hath spoken this word. The land mourneth and fadeth away; . . . . the curse hath devoured the land; . . . . few men left. The new wine mourneth, the

Digitized by Google

vine languisheth, all the merry-hearted do sigh; . . . . all joy is darkened, the mirth of the land is gone." (Isa. xxiv. 3—11.) (7.) We remembered that the true tenants of the land were scattered, at that moment, among all the nations of the earth, a people without a country and without a friend, yet a distinct and separate and vast people still. We again opened the Word, and found it written,—"Lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth." (Amos ix. 9.) We were awe-struck. *No spiritualizing here.* We beheld in those visible footprints of Jehovah *his* interpretations of *prophecies already fulfilled.*—We next bethought us of the *prophecies yet unfulfilled.* We read, for example, in Amos ix. 13—15, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord . . . . . that I will bring again the captivity of my people of Israel, and they shall build the waste cities and inhabit them; . . . and I will plant them upon their land, and they *shall no more be pulled up out of their land* which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God." And, turning to Isaiah lxv. 18—25, we read, "Behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing and her people a joy . . . and they shall build houses and inhabit them," &c. We saw *before* us *a country without a people,* and we had left *behind* us *a people without a country.* Why, we asked ourselves, *that one vacant land,* and *that one landless people,* both so manifestly kept, as it were, in widowhood by a standing miracle of eighteen centuries? What else *can* God mean than a *literal* fulfilment of the still outstanding promise? Has the awful threatening been executed to the very letter, and shall the promise *in spite of this miraculous preparation for its accomplishment also to the very letter,* be frittered away into a mere figure of speech which may mean anything or nothing? In the presence of Divine sayings so plain and of Divine doings so unmistakeable, we should have blushed to hesitate about an answer. That *shall* be a *literal* restoration. But *we could not stop here.* We remembered in Bethlehem, in Nazareth, in Bethany, in Gethsemane, that, in *literal* fulfilment of the prophetic word, there had once walked and wept, and groaned and struggled there, the incarnate Prince of Peace. We thought of the prophecies, still unfulfilled, which announce his *Second* Coming: we found the words announcing each, alike explicit. If, concerning his Humiliation-Advent, it had been plainly written that he should be "brought as a lamb to the slaughter," no less plainly was it written, concerning his Advent in glory, "His feet shall

Digitized by Google

stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east." (Zech. xiv. 4.) To us, indeed, (judging according to man's judgment,) the *literal* accomplishment of the *latter* prediction seemed scarcely less improbable than did the literal accomplishment of the former to Peter, when, as the crucifixion was announced by the Lord to be drawing near, the earnest but hasty man "took him and began to rebuke him." The very idea was repugnant to all the notions we had imbibed in what Coleridge justly styles our own "school of philosophy." And, accordingly, we had hitherto disposed of all such passages by stretching them—violently enough, as we felt, at times—on this Procrustean-bed. But, on calmly looking at the prophetic word, and pursuing the *analogy of interpretation derived from past fulfilment*, we felt that, without casting to the winds all consistency in prophetical interpretation, and especially without rejecting Israel's literal restoration, there was no alternative but to surrender. And so we resolved to become as a little child again,—to *unlearn our old theories*, and *accept none but God's*. The scene around us, we felt, might well discipline us into submission. On every spot there seemed engraven, as with Jehovah's own finger, this inscription:—"My ways are not as your ways, neither are my thoughts like yours." We saw that all along there had been put the most emphatic rebuke on all man's theories and anticipations: we saw that we could not tell, *à priori*, what the Lord's plans might be: we saw, moreover, that the only method of ascertaining them was to go direct to the Word: Opening that Word, we found that not more express and palpable were the announcements given to Israel, in *literal* accordance with which Jesus had come the *first time* to offer himself a sacrifice for sin, than are the announcements encouraging the Church to hope for a *literal Second Advent* as the *mode of introducing the longed-for redemption-era:* We acquiesced adoringly, saying, "Even so, O Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight:" we did more; finding how animating and soul-stirring was the "hope," we went on our way rejoicingly, crying, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

But we must close. And, leaving to another occasion a detailed examination of those scripture instances which prove how largely instrumental towards a holy and heavenly walk has been this "blessed hope," and contenting ourselves with having exhibited in this article the *principle* in the Christian's spiritual dynamics on which the fact so proved rests,—we must, in closing, be allowed, on one point, a word

Digitized by Google

of respectful but earnest vindication. It has been not unusual to charge *premillenarianism* with *a tendency to underrate, or, at least, practically to withdraw the soul's regard from the preciousness of Christ crucified.* That certain maintainers of the doctrine may have manifested this tendency is no more unlikely than that certain maintainers of Calvinism have personally substituted the inanimate skeleton of a doctrinal orthodoxy for the living, breathing frame of the warm-hearted Christian. But *the premillenarianism of the Bible is cast in no such mould.* If, indeed, it be that a man who is yet dead in sin—who is an enemy of God, a stranger to his holy home and fellowship, can long for an era whose grand characteristic is Christ's absolute supremacy as his Father's King, reigning in the midst of his ransomed ones, and consuming all his Father's enemies,—then may premillenarianism consist with a present cold-heartedness towards the person of the slain Lamb. But if it be, on the other hand, that not until, by faith in Christ crucified, I have entered God's family, and, because of my sonship, have received "the spirit of adoption," can I, in the putting forth of my filial breathings, long for that era after which Jesus my elder Brother, by the same Spirit, breathes,—then does it not follow that *the only mould* in which Bible millenarianism can be cast is *the man whose eye is fixed humbly and believingly on the crucified and risen Saviour?* 1. Such a man was *Job,* when, in the extremity of his martyr-agony, he exclaimed (xix. 25, 26), "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though, after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." The *Coming* he longs for is the Lord's *Second* Advent, for a feature of the scene is resurrection-joy: the Coming is *literal,* for he shall *in his "flesh"*— —his renovated body— see God—see a literal and visible Immanuel: the Coming is *to this earth,* for "standing on the earth," Christ shall be seen by him: the Coming ushers in Job's rest and glory. So that, viewed in the additional light thrown on it in other passages by the one Spirit, this Coming is plainly premillennial. But what is the element which gives to the "blessed hope" all its vitality and power? It is the *consciousness* that he is *himself already a pardoned sinner* —already accepted through the imputed work of the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world"—already "alive," because he can say with a steady faith, "I know that *my Redeemer liveth.*" 2. Such also was *Paul,* when, in language not dissimilar, he wrote to the Colossians by the same Spirit (iii. 4), "When Christ, who is our life, shall

Digitized by Google

appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." The "*glorious appearing*" is longed for, because, like Job, he can say for himself and his fellow-martyrs, "Christ *is our life*." 3. Such also was *David*, when (Psalm l.) realizing, by that faith which is "the substance of things hoped for," the very solemnities of the Advent era, and recognising (ver. 2) in the cloud amid which his Lord descends, the identical cloud out of which, on Mount Sion, he was wont to manifest his graciousness, he hears the voice exclaiming, "Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice. And the heavens (rejoins the psalmist) shall declare his righteousness." The "joy" of the era is, that God is glorified—that his righteousness is declared; and David is able to enter into the joy—why? Because *personally* he has already made a covenant with the Lord by sacrifice"—is already a *reconciled* and Spirit-inhabited man. 4. Such also is *the bride*, when, in the full animation of the "blessed hope," she exclaims (Song ii. 17), "Turn, my beloved, and be thou like a roe or a young hart upon the mountains of Bether." He for whose Advent she longs so eagerly *is to her no stranger;* the love she bears to him is no cold, uncertain love: "My beloved," she has just been testifying, "is mine and I am his; he feedeth among the lilies, until the day break and the shadows flee away." Blessed attitude! Behold the child *at once* of *faith* and of *hope!* The *hope* is her Lord's return—his *speedy personal return;* for though "mountains" intervene, these oppose, she knows, but a feeble barrier to the Advent of him whose "feet are as hinds' feet." And the hope is so eager, because the *faith* is so lively and so firm. Amidst the tribulation of the martyr-era —"till the day break and the shadows flee away"—she is, indeed, as "a lily among thorns;" but her Lord, she is assured, "feedeth" the while "among the lilies,"—deems it his very "meat" to comfort and sustain his own. Loved and loving so devotedly, she "loves," waits, watches for "his appearing."

Such, then, is the basis of the Church's hope. By this "*hope*" she has been "*saved*" during all the by-past watches of the night. The "hope" is *still needed,* for the night is not yet over; nay, needed *now more than ever,* for each successive watch seems only to thicken the night's gloom and intensify its piercing coldness. To him who anticipates the Church's and the earth's coming jubilee through the *gradual introduction of a spiritual millennium,* we can exhibit, in the present downward course of spirituality in the one, and in the deepening flood of ungodliness over the other, *nothing*

Digitized by Google

to encourage—everything to *discourage* and *cast down.* But the man who believes that the *culminating point* of the *Church's inertness* and of the *world's raging defiance* is the very predestined *season* of the *arrival* of *Him whose right it is to reign,*—we can *confidently summon to the liveliest hope,* the *most incessant watching,* the *most devoted* and *unremitting zeal.* In our night-journeys through the Desert, we remember that, as the night hastened on, the darkness grew deeper and the cold more chilling, until, *within half an hour of sunrise,* we had *reached the night's crisis.* The sun appeared. The "*shadows,*" —so brief was the twilight,—*literally* "*fled away.*" In *less than half an hour* we had *exchanged* the *night's cold* and *gloom* for the *full blaze* and *genial warmth of a morning eastern sun.* We thought of the "blessed hope." Now we are children of the night, waiting for the coming dawn. A brief interval longer—it *may* be very brief—and, standing in the presence of our Father's King, we shall lift our voices in adoring thanksgiving, and cry—cry to the "redeemed" saints around us—cry to a "redeemed" earth—cry to our "redeemed" selves, "O sing unto the Lord a new song; for he hath done marvellous things; his right hand and his holy arm hath gotten him the victory: the Lord hath *made known* his *salvation;* his righteousness hath he openly showed in the sight of the heathen: he hath remembered his mercy and his truth toward the house of Israel: all the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God. Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all the earth. . . . . Make a joyful noise BEFORE THE LORD THE KING." (Psalm xcviii. 1—6.)

ART. V.—THE SUCCESSORS OF NEBUCHADNEZZAR.

VARIOUS attempts have been made to reconcile the book of Daniel with the canon of Ptolemy, as to the successors of Nebuchadnezzar. None of these appears to be so simple and satisfactory as that contained in the following paper, the kernel of which may be found in an essay on Nebuchadnezzar and his Times, by M. Court. de Gebelin, in his "Monde Primitif," tom. viii. His object is to show that—

Daniel's	Nebuchadnezzar	was Ptolemy's	Nabocolassar,	reigned	43	years.
„	Belshazzar	„	Ilvarodamus,	„	2	„
„	Darius the Mede	„	Nericolassar,	„	4	„
„	Grandson of Nebr	„	Nabonadius,	„	17	„
„	Cyrus	„	Cyrus,	„	9	„

A few preliminary remarks. What is commonly called the book of Daniel properly consists of two books, each of which is no more than a sketch, and merely anecdotal. The first is written in the Chaldean, with the exception of the introduction, i.—ii. 4, which is written in the Hebrew. This book, which comprises the first six chapters of Daniel, is chiefly historical, and in *chronological order*. And observe, that the first chapter is to be understood of the captivity of Daniel, until the first year Nebuchadnezzar, as it was reckoned at Babylon, and in the canon of Ptolemy; for the name of *Cyrus* (i. 21), seems to have crept into the text by mistake, being probably derived from vi. 28,—"Otez le nom de Cyrus, et tout va de suite." (Gebelin, viii. 37.) Thus—

Chapter.	Reign.	
I. Daniel's Captivity	First year	Nebuchadnezzar.
II. Prophecy of the Image . . .	Second year	„
III. The Fiery Furnace		„
IV. Decree of Nebuchadnezzar . .	Last year	„
V. The Handwriting	„	Belshazzar.
VI. The Lion's Den	First year	Darius the Mede.

The second book is written in Hebrew, with the exception of the introduction (chap. vii.), which is written in the Chaldean. This book, comprising the last six chapters, is strictly prophetical, but in *chronological order*. Thus—

Chapter.	Reign.	
VII. Prophecy of Wild Beasts.	First year	Belshazzar.
VIII. Ram and Goat . . .	Third year	„
IX. Seventy weeks . . .	First year	Darius the Mede.
X. XI. XII. Scripture of Truth . .	Third year	Cyrus, king of Persia.

We proceed to unfold and confirm M. de Gebelin's argument.

I. Belshazzar was Ilvarodamus.

Bossuet, in his "Universal History," has this just remark: "That as Eastern monarchs assumed several names, or several titles, which afterwards were used as proper names; and as different nations pronounced and translated those names differently, hence great obscurity in ancient history has been the necessary consequence." Nevertheless, in this case, we may discern that the immediate successor of Nebuchadnezzar was his son, and that son variously named Belshazzar, and Evil-merodach, *alias* Ilvarodamus.

First, it is plain that Nebuchadnezzar had a successor, whose name was Belshazzar; but it is no less plain that he

Digitized by Google

was his son; for throughout Daniel v., Nebuchadnezzar is repeatedly called his *father*. Observe, by *Daniel*, both in his character of historian (ver. 2), and of counsellor (ver. 18, 22). By *Belshazzar* himself (ver. 13), and by the *Queen* mother, (ver. 11.) And if the repetition of that term *father* by the Queen thrice in that one sentence do not plainly and emphatically express his own natural father, then there is no precision in plain narrative. Therefore, Belshazzar was the son, and certainly a successor, of Nebuchadnezzar.

Next, the immediate successor of Nebuchadnezzar was named Evil-merodach: and who was his son—*his immediate successor;* for Jehoiachin (Jeconiah) was made captive in the eighth year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, according to the Jews' reckoning in the provinces. (2 Kings xxiv. 8—12.) But that eighth year was the sixth year, according to the Babylonian reckoning in the capital, and also according to the canon of Ptolemy. Now, in the first year of the reign of Evil-merodach (the first according to all reckonings), he shewed kindness to Jehoiachin, then in the thirty-seventh year of his captivity. (2 Kings xxv. 27—30.) Add to those thirty-seven years the six years of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, and you have the total forty-three years of Nebuchadnezzar, according to the canon. Hence, Evil-merodach was the immediate successor to Nebuchadnezzar; and that this Evil-merodach was also his son, is the direct testimony of Berosus and others.

Now, since we have nowhere a hint that Nebuchadnezzar was ever succeeded by more than one son, we conclude that his own son, who immediately succeeded him, was variously named Belshazzar, and Evil-merodach, *alias* Ilvarodamus.

And lastly, as to these various names, the Ilvarodamus of the canon, otherwise spelt Illoarudamus, seems to be a mere *alias* of Evil-merodach; and moreover, Evil-merodach appears to be at least of an equivalent meaning to Belshazzar; for (1), Evil-merodach is compounded of *Merodach* (the name of a Babylonian idol, found in closest connexion with *Bel*, Jer. iv. 11), and *Evil*, which, as Simonis thought, may signify "first;" that is, Prince of Merodach, or dear to Merodach. And (2), Belshazzar (the name given to Daniel on his promotion, ii. 28; iv. 8), is compounded of *Bel*, the name of a Babylonian idol, and another term, which to the eye assumes the various forms of *assar*, *tazar*, *czar*, &c., but always signifying "Prince;" the prince of Bel, or dear to Bel.

Here, however, one or two objections may be started.

Digitized by Google

Possibly it may be objected that Belshazzar could not be Ilvarodamus, because the latter, according to the canon, reigned only two years; whereas, according to the Second Book of Daniel, viii. 1, he had a vision in the third year of Belshazzar's reign. But this may receive a double answer. (1.) That the canon refers each reign, not to the actual accession of the King, but to the beginning of the current Egyptian year. The reign, therefore, of Ilvarodamus may have been abridged to two years, supposing Belshazzar to have died soon after the vision, viz., in the beginning of his third year. But (2.), it is in the canon, according to the copy of Theon, that the reign of Ilvarodamus is reckoned at two years; according to the copy of Syncellus, it is actually reckoned at three years.

The objection arising from a common error, that of confounding the *idol feast*, in which Babylon was taken, with the *impious feast* of Belshazzar, will be discussed hereafter, in its proper place; but this is the proper place for one or two remarks on Belshazzar's feast. First, by number, weight, and measure, all things were created and still consist; but in the vision and prophecy of that awful night, the sentence was, "Number, number, weight, and *division*—thy kingdom is *divided*, and given to the Medes and Persians." Now, according to our reconciliation, this term "divided" would immediately begin to have an incipient fulfilment, in this sense; that his kingdom would be given first to Darius the Mede, and then, after an interval of some years (during which it would revert to Nebuchadnezzar's grandson), next it should be given to the Persians. And this view of the subject will be confirmed when we come to consider a general objection which may be made to our next article. But, secondly, the remark of Freret on Belshazzar's feast is more important. "If," says he, "the city was not only besieged, but the river already diverted, and the troops of Cyrus actually entering within the walls, Daniel on that night might possibly have detected something of all this; and in that case so experienced a statesman might have foreseen, *without the spirit of prophecy*, and yet with the highest probability, what needs must be the fate of the Babylonian empire; but if the prophecy of that night was uttered just twenty-one years before the taking of Babylon (the interval in the canon from the last year of Ilvarodamus), then the prediction of Daniel could have been made *only by Divine revelation*." (*Mem. des Inscr. et B. L.*, tome vii.) Moreover, according to the chronology of Herodotus (see Larcher), Cyrus was

Digitized by Google

just then, at the early age of sixteen, contending with his grandfather, Astyages, and the Medes and Persians themselves were at that very time divided, and in actual conflict.

II. Darius the Mede was Nericolassar.

That the immediate successor to Belshazzar was called *Darius the Mede*, is the unquestionable testimony of Daniel, a cotemporary, and on the spot. "In that night was Belshazzar, the king of the Chaldeans, slain; and Darius the Mede took the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old." (ver. 30, 31.) In another passage: "In the first year of Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which (or in which, he) was made king of the Chaldeans," (ix. 1.) This last passage has been generally received to indicate the same Darius as the preceding, and surely with the greatest reason; for in each Darius is called either the Mede, or of the seed of the Medes, and in each he is said either to have taken the kingdom, or (more exactly) to have been made king of the Chaldeans; certainly this similarity of phrase strongly indicates the same identical person. But next, that the immediate successor to Evil-merodach (already shewn to have been Belshazzar) was called *Nericolassar*, is the unquestioned testimony of Berosus and others. Now, since there is nowhere a hint that the monarchy of Evil-merodach was succeeded by two contemporary kings, it follows therefore that the monarch called *Darius the Mede*, according to Daniel, was otherwise called *Nericolassar*, according to Ptolemy.

It may just be remarked, that according to the canon of Ptolemy, the name of the Babylonian idol (Isa. xlvi. 1), *Nabo*, so common in the family of Nebuchadnezzar, disappears in that of his second successor; instead of which *Nerig* (the Tsabian name for Mars) is combined with the usual *assar*, *tazar*, *czar*, or prince—the Prince of Nerig, or dear to Nerig. Hence, probably *Nericolassar*, according to the canon, was the royal title, and *Darius* (scrupulously retained by the prophet Daniel) was the proper name.

Next for objections. One general objection may perhaps occur from the phrase repeated in Dan. vi.: "according to the law of the *Medes and Persians*, which altereth not." Hence it may be hastily inferred that the empire of *Persia* must have been already established in Babylon. But not so; for, notwithstanding the penury of historical information relative to those times, we know that the Queen of Nebu-

Digitized by Google

chadnezzar was a Mede, to gratify whose taste for mountain scenery the hanging gardens at Babylon were constructed. We know that Nericolassar married the sister of Evil-merodach, *i. e.*, the daughter of Nebuchadnezzar. We know that Nericolassar obtained the throne by a conspiracy against the life of Evil-merodach. We know also that Persia had already lost her independence, under Cyaxares the First, the king of the Medes; and hence Darius *the Mede* would naturally be plied at Babylon (where a Median party must obviously have prevailed at court) with "the law of the *Medes and Persians*, which altereth not." The phrase only indicates that, however despotic the kings of the Medes had become after the accession of Dejoces, and especially after the subjugation of the Persians, so that they claimed to equal the gods themselves, yet for all that, they had not the power to revoke their own decrees.

A particular objection may possibly be started from the closing sentence of the first book of Daniel, vi. 28: "So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian." But the sentence may signify no more than this: that by the Divine Providence, Daniel flourished even in those two reigns of Darius the Mede and Cyrus the Persian, although both were foreign dynasties, no less than during the proper dynasty of Nebuchadnezzar, his own original patron. (See Dan. ii. 48, 49; iv. 18, 19.) It certainly cannot hence be inferred, from such a sentence in such a mere sketch of history, that Darius the Mede was the immediate predecessor to Cyrus.

It has been indeed generally received that Daniel's *Darius the Mede* was the same person as Xenophon's Cyaxares, the *king of Media.* Daniel, however, does not call Darius the king of Media, but only either *the Mede*, or the son of Ahasuerus, *of the seed of the Medes.* Does then Xenophon say that Cyaxares was the son of Ahasuerus? No, but the son of Astyages. Has any one proved that Ahasuerus and Astyages are one and the same person? None. Does Xenophon himself say, or has any one proved, that Cyaxares was otherwise called Darius? No, it has been merely assumed, not proved. What then does he say? That after Babylon was taken, Cyrus shared the empire with his uncle, Cyaxares, king of Media, and gave him the first rank in it. But since it may be questioned whether such an heroical act be perfectly in keeping with Cyrus's historical character, by what authority then this has been said may also fairly be questioned. From what other historian, or even in what

Digitized by Google

history of his own, has Xenophon recorded this? Neither; it is only so stated in his Cyropædia, which, according to the opinion of all ancients and moderns, Plato, Diogenes, Laertius, Cicero, Erasmus, Scaliger, is merely an historical or political romance; and that it was designed for no other by Xenophon himself, an accomplished man, is apparent from its glaring anachronisms. (Freret, *Mem. des Inscr. et B. L.*, tome vii.) Is a political romance, an Utopia, an Argenis, or Telemachus, to be received as historical testimony? Only keep to simple history, whether sacred or profane, and it will still remain that Daniel's *Darius the Mede* was Ptolemy's *Nericolassar.*

One or two inferential remarks may be made upon this article. First, on this point Daniel's prophecy of *the Scripture* of truth seems both to give and receive light. In those days (the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia) Daniel was mourning "*three weeks of days,*" x. 1, 2; after which he sees a vision of terrible majesty, in the person of Michael, and of a comforter in Gabriel. "Fear not, Daniel, for from the first day that thou didst set thy heart to understand, and to chasten thyself before God, I came for thy words." He plainly refers to *the first year of Darius the Mede,* when he received the prophecy of the seventy weeks. (ix. 3, 31—23.) He adds, "But the prince of Persia withstood me *twenty-one days.*" He does not mean the before-mentioned "three weeks of days," (another phrase for the nonce), but *twenty-one prophetic days; the very number of years which, according to the canon, had intervened between the first year of Darius the Mede and the first year of Cyrus and his decree.* He proceeds: "But lo! (pointing to the vision) Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me, and I remained there with (on the side of) the kings of Persia." (x. 13.) He means Cyrus and his successors. He further adds, that times again would change, and that he should again be opposed to the prince of Persia, in consequence of which the prince of Javan should come in. (x. 20; viii. 1.) He means the Macedonian dominion. He then concludes this preliminary information with re-affirming, that in all these affairs he had the co-operation of Michael, even since *the first year of Darius the Mede,* "when I," says Gabriel, "even I stood to confirm and strengthen him." (x. 21; xi. 1.) Now, if these last words signify, as they are generally understood, to strengthen Darius in his government, then, while Gabriel stood on the side of Darius the Mede, and opposed to the prince of Persia, *for twenty-one years,* it follows that Daniel's

Digitized by Google

Darius the Mede could not possibly be Xenophon's Cyaxares, the king of Media, who was Cyrus's uncle and ally. And as to the prophecy, when Darius the Mede was prepared to issue his decree (that the God of Israel should be honoured) then Gabriel was with him, or on his side. Again, when Cyrus was prepared to issue his decree in favour of Jerusalem, then Gabriel was with *him;* and, however times would change in favour of the prince of Javan, Gabriel would still act in co-operation with Michael, the prince and friend of Israel, to the last. (xii. 1.)

An additional ray of light seems also to gleam from this quarter, upon an obscure point in the prophecy of *the seventy weeks.* That prophecy was given *in the first year of Darius the Mede;* but it was in that very year also that Daniel (for the first time as it should seem) "understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem. (ix. 1, 2; Jer. xxiv. 11.) But the first year of Darius the Mede (or Nericolassar) was, according to the canon, at the distance of twenty-one years from the decree of Cyrus; and if so, Daniel must therefore have understood that the desolations of Jerusalem had that term of years still to run, unless they could be averted. We find him, in fact, trying the prevalence of intercession; he might deceive himself with the example of Abraham, but, however, it seems to have been in his case a strong instance of the vanity of human wishes.

But there was probably one circumstance which tempted him, the *recent* decree of Darius that the God of Israel should be honoured. We say probably, for, considering all the circumstances, the late honours conferred on Daniel by Belshazzar, confirmed and augmented by Darius, and probably not without the interest of the Queen-mother; considering that the consequent envy of the Median courtiers might be plausibly veiled under the pretence of supporting a foreign succession by an immediate decree, that extraordinary honours should be offered to the new monarch; all this considered, it does seem highly probable that the scheme to ensnare the prophet would suffer no delay, but be expedited even in the first year of Darius the Mede. But the decree of Darius immediately followed the miracle of the lions' den; and that decree may have excited the hopes of Daniel for his people, and encouraged him to intercede for his holy city.

But however that be, in the first year of Darius the Mede

Digitized by Google

the prophecy of the seventy weeks was given. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgressions, and to seal up sins." Now, (1.) undoubtedly the grand and *ultimate sense* of this signified, that after a given date, for the same period of seventy sevens of years, during which the land had been deprived of her Sabbaths, they must wait for their great deliverer, the Messiah (of another seed than that of the Medes), who should then come, and at last in his glory to put an end to their national transgressions and sins for ever. But still there remains the great difficulty, and so long felt, namely, where then in this prophecy do we find the specific answer to the prayer of the prophet's petition? The answer we should say, (2.) conveyed a direct refusal of his petition; a refusal to abridge the term of a Divine prophecy which had still more than twenty years to run. "Seventy sevens of years are determined." As much as to say, for that whole period the law had been despised, and the land robbed of her Sabbaths, and for that whole period the number of Sabbaths must be repaid, and the desolations continue. *In such a sense*, the clause would readily be understood by Daniel, familiar as he was with the law, and fresh from the prophet Jeremiah. (Compare Lev. xxvi. 34; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 20, 21; Jer. xxv. 11, 12.) And this sense appears to relieve the difficulty; but which difficulty, if the first year of Darius was posterior to the capture of Babylon, and consequently if the decree of Cyrus was so nigh at hand, must still remain unmitigated.

III. Nabonadius was Grandson of Nebuchadnezzar.

The two last dates in the books of Daniel are the first year of Darius the Mede and the third year of Cyrus the Persian, in the interval between which Daniel had neither miracle nor prophecy to record; but within that very interval, according to the canon, the seventeen years of Nabonadius were included. Accordingly, we read nothing of Nabonadius in the books of Daniel, neither should we have any concern with the contradictions of profane history concerning him, were it not that, according to sacred history and prophecy: "All nations should serve Nebuchadnezzar, his son, and his son's son, until the very time of his land come; and then many nations and great kings should serve themselves of him." (2 Chron. xxxvi. 20, 21; Jer. xxvii. 7.)

However, the whole question lies within a small compass, and we have only to call four witnesses—Herodotus, Berosus, Megasthenes, and Ptolemy. *Herodotus*, the father of profane

Digitized by Google

history, but contemporary with the latest writers of sacred history, wrote, about a century after Nabonadius was dethroned, B.C. 445—408. *Berosus*, a Chaldean priest, was contemporary with Alexander about B.C. 334—323. He carried back the antiquity of the Babylonian empire to 150,000 years; and in order to support this fabulous chronology, pretended that Nabonassar burnt all the records prior to his reign. It is no great recommendation of this witness that a similar tale has been invented in China for a similar purpose. *Megasthenes* wrote his "History of India"—the work is lost—about B.C. 300. *Ptolemy* flourished about the commencement of the Christian era, and his canon is the main basis of profane chronology for the period in question. Two of these four, the earliest and the most accurate, are in favour of the fact to be established, that Nabonadius was the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar. However, let us first hear the others.

Megasthenes says: "They crowned Nabannidochus, who had no connexion with the royal family. In his reign Cyrus took Babylon, and granted him a principality in Carmania." He denies the connexion; he is a witness, however, that the last king of Babylon bore this name, which it is to be observed included the title so common in the family of Nebuchadnezzar, from their idol Nabo. Thus his grandson, by his daughter and Nericolassar (whose reign but nine months merged in the fourth year of his father,) was called *Labo*, or *Nabo*soroarchod; L and N frequently alternating.

Berosus says: "After the death of Laborosoarchod, the conspirators, by common consent, placed the crown on the head of Nabonnedus, one of the leaders of the insurrection, and of the family of Babylon;" *τινι των εκ του Βαβυλωνος*, the gender of the last article suggesting that *οικου* is understood. The fact implied may be this, that whereas Nabosoroarchod was the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar by Nericolassar and his daughter; the last king, Nabonnedus, descended directly from his blood, through his son, Evil-merodach, *i.e.*, Belshazzar.

Ptolemy testifies only to the name and order of succession; let us then hear the earliest witness. Herodotus says, i. 188 (after some account of the works of Nitocris): "Against the son of this woman, who had the same name as his own father, Labonetus, Cyrus waged war." Labonetus—so it is spelt in one MS.—is only another form of Nabonetus, and is the name by which Nebuchadnezzar is known in Herodotus, l. 74. The evidence then of Herodotus is that Labonetus,

against whom Cyrus warred, was *the son* of Nebuchadnezzar by Nitocris. He does not deny the connexion with the royal family, but mistakes the grandson for the son—an error arising from the identity of the name, combined with the fact of the survivance of Nitocris. Notwithstanding this error, Scaliger, Vitringa, and others, are of opinion that the last king of Babylon, according to the canon, Nabonadius was the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar, according to the prophecy. (Jer. xxxvii. 7.)

It has been indeed generally received that the last king of Babylon was Belshazzar, who was slain at a feast, which has been confounded with that feast at which Babylon was taken. But history distinguishes them. Belshazzar's feast is described by Daniel as one which " the king made to a *thousand of his lords*." The feast at which Babylon fell is thus described by Herodotus. " From the size of the city when those at the confines were taken, those who dwelt in the centre of Babylon did not know of it, *for it happened at a feast of theirs*, at which time they were dancing, and in high revelry, until indeed they knew it but too well." It was an accustomed feast of all the Babylonians; and so it was understood by Xenophon: " When Cyrus heard that there was a feast in Babylon, in which *all the Babylonians* drink and revel all the night." It was not merely a royal banquet given to a thousand lords, of which Cyrus might never have heard, but an accustomed feast, well known, doubtless, and a much greater opportunity as engaging all the Babylonians. M. Court de Gebelia quotes Berosus, from Athenæus, (Deipnosoph xiv. 17) to show that this accustomed feast was the origin of the Saturnalia. The masters then waited on their servants; one of whom, in a royal mantle, became the head of the house, and was called Zogan, or the governor! It began on the 16th day of the month Loüs, and was called the feast of Sacæ, being celebrated in honour of their god Sach, or Sesach. May we conjecture this idol's name had any connexion with the term Shesh—*hemp*, whose intoxicating product is well known as the *bang* of modern India.

However, hence we should distinguish between the city and the idol in Jer. li. 39—41; xxv. 6: " In their heat I will make their feasts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice, and sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake, saith the Lord. How is Sheshac taken, and how is the praise of the whole earth surprised!"

Again, Jer. li. 31, 32: " One post shall run to meet another, and one messenger to meet another, to show the king of

Digitized by Google

Babylon that his city is taken at one end; and that the passages are stopped, and the reeds (or forts) they have burned with fire, and the men of war are affrighted." Could language describe more energetically that the king of Babylon was at a distance from his capital when it was captured? And such was the fact. "In the seventeenth year of Nabonnedus, (says Berosus,) Cyrus came out of Persia with a great army, and having conquered all the rest of Asia, he advanced hastily into Babylonia. Nabonnedùs, perceiving his approach, assembled his own forces and opposed him, but was defeated, and fled with a few of his adherents, and shut himself up in the city of Borsippus. Upon this, Cyrus took Babylon, and from thence he marched to Borsippus," &c. When Babylon was taken, her last king was absent, and he was not slain at all; but Belshazzar was slain at Babylon. He was the father of her last king.

Upon the whole, it should seem that as to the successors of Nebuchadnezzar, a satisfactory harmony has been established between sacred history and profane. And such a reconciliation can never be a barren speculation. One error draws in its train many others; and the discovery of one truth, to say the least, dissipates many difficulties.

Art. VI.—LETTERS TO AN INQUIRER.

Letter V.

PREJUDICES.

My dear Friend,—*Prejudice*, you know, literally means judgment beforehand,—premature judgment,—judgment independent of, and anterior to the adduction of the evidence upon which all true judgment must be formed. It is frequently used in a stronger sense, as expressive of unreasonable and foolish dislike; but I am content to take it simply in its first meaning.

Now, I complain that there is much of prejudice abroad respecting millenarianism. Under the influence of prejudice, many put it at once aside, repelling all proof, and refusing all inquiry. They have made up their minds, or rather their feelings against it, and they decline considering the subject. From education or companionships, or some special circumstances, they have imbibed a thorough aversion to the

Digitized by Google

doctrine, and they turn away with suspicion, if not with bitterness, from any one that would press it upon their notice.

Let me notice some of these prejudices, and try briefly to meet them. All that I desire is, that our doctrine should be looked at fairly and manfully, whether the result be its reception or rejection.

PREJUDICE I.—*Premillennialism is a carnal system.*—But how is it *carnal?* A Gnostic or a Swedenborgian might say so, for they believe all that is material to be carnal. But will any thorough believer in the INCARNATION,—any one who knows that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh, say so? Was Adam's Paradise a carnal thing? Is resurrection a carnal thing? Are the new heavens and new earth carnal things? Why should we speak as if the body were a hinderance, instead of a helpmeet to the soul; or as if all matter were a hinderance, not a helpmeet to spirit? It was not carnal in the Son of God to be made flesh, and dwell among us. It was not carnal in the angels to visit and converse with Abraham. It was not carnal in Moses and Elijah to descend upon Mount Tabor, and associate with Peter and James and John. Men have surely a confused, vague idea of what *carnal* means; otherwise, they would be so disposed to pity us for our carnality, and turn away from our doctrines for being such. It would be well if objectors would analyse and define their own ideas, before giving them forth.

PREJUDICE II.—*Premillennialism is associated with heresy and extravagance.*—That this has been the case in one or two instances, I admit, but more than this I deny. Nor can I conceive of anything in controversy more unfair and unmanly, than to brand and vilify premillennialism on account of the follies of one or two of its maintainers. What doctrine could stand such a test? The truth is, that premillennialism has been far more associated with truth than with error, with orthodoxy than with heresy, with sobriety than with extravagance. The first opponents of our system were men utterly unsound in the faith,—men who denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit, the full inspiration of Scripture, and the eternity of future punishments. There is scarcely one heretical Church or sect from that day downward, such as the Romish and Socinian, that has not vehemently opposed and denounced premillennialism. It is not *our* system, but that of our opponents, that from the third century downward to the present day has been associated with the most flagrant heresies.

Digitized by Google

PREJUDICE III.—*Premillennialism is a novelty.*—It is not so. It was the belief of the apostolic Church, and till the third century was never denied. From that day to this, it has always had some in the Churches to maintain it. Nor have these been the weakest, or the least pious, or the most unlearned.

PREJUDICE IV.—*Most of the godly in our day reject it.*—It may be so. I do not enter into the question of *numbers.* That cannot settle truth. It might be true, though not one held it. It is to the word of the living God that we appeal, —not the testimony or authority of man.

PREJUDICE V.—*It disorganizes theology.*—This I do not admit. It consolidates, but it neither rends nor dislocates theology. It fits in admirably with all that we have been accustomed to associate with sound doctrine. Nay, it lends coherence and consistency to parts of theology which without it hang but loosely together, and which do not appear to us to admit of a right adjustment on any but premillennial principles. That it upsets many of our old *ideas* I do not deny. That it crumbles into atoms the bright fabric which many are building up for the world, I concede. That it gives a new conception of the proper nature of missions, a new conception far more scriptural, and far more likely to lead to vigorous and decisive action, I grant. But I deny the injury said to be done by it to theology. I look upon the accusation as wholly gratuitous.

PREJUDICE VI.—*Premillennialism takes for granted a third Advent.*—I have heard it positively asserted, that we did believe in a *third* Advent. Proof has been led from Scripture to show that there can be no third Advent, and this has been deemed sufficient refutation. But as we believe only in a first and second Advent, and as no millennarian that I ever heard of believed in more, such a mode of refutation was as easy as it was superfluous.

I might mention other prejudices that have taken hold of men's minds, and by which they are repelled even from the study of the question,—but these will suffice as specimens.

Has any other doctrine ever been treated so unfairly and so ungenerously?

Is prejudice to be the test of truth? Is it thus that we are to regulate what we ought, and what we ought not to study? Is it thus that we are exhibiting the character of saints, or fulfilling our responsibilities to Him who hath given us his Word, that we might make it our study day and night; settling all questions by a direct appeal to it alone,

Digitized by Google

whatever be our own previous opinion, or the judgment of man upon the subject? * I am, &c., yours,

July, 1849. ———.

Letter VI.

MISAPPREHENSIONS.

My dear Friend,—If, in these Letters, I should have occasion to use the term "new dispensation," in reference to the millennial age, and in contrast with the present, I trust that I shall not be mistaken, and that the expression will not be laid hold of to the prejudice of truth. I suspect that not a few stand aloof from the truth regarding Christ's coming and kingdom, under the persuasion that our system is based upon the theory of a "new dispensation,"—a dispensation fundamentally diverse from that of grace, wherein we now stand and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

In this there has been much misapprehension. We do not expect a dispensation in any essential principle different from the present. We believe that the dispensation of grace is to remain unaltered; only widening in its results, till it cover the whole earth with holy blessedness, and administered by the Lord Jesus Christ himself in person here; not as hitherto, from within the veil, but without it, upon the throne,—the throne of David, the beloved,—the throne of Solomon, the Prince of Peace,—the throne of Melchizedec, King of Salem and King of Righteousness.

In truth, there has been but one dispensation from the day that man transgressed. Grace then came in to meet man's

* A reviewer in Scotland has noticed my former letters, and specially attacked one statement. I had said, in substance, that no anti-millennarian has ever ventured upon a *positive* argument in favour of his own theory. All works upon that side of the question have contented themselves with overthrowing our system, but have not adduced positive proof-texts in behalf of their own, *i. e.*, in behalf of the priority of the millennium to the Advent. The writer calls my statement a "palpable misrepresentation." As I feel assured that it is no misrepresentation, but a *bare fact*, I repeat it here; and I have reason to know, that some who are not pre-millennialists are at one with me on this point, and think, that, instead of attempting to deny the fact, it would be better at once to produce the proof-texts, *if there are any*. Nay, more, the reviewer *admits* virtually that I am right, for he says, "We are very little concerned with whether there will be a millennium or no before the Advent." ("Free Church Magazine" for January, p. 29.) Does not this mean, "we have no texts to produce?" If not, what does it mean? And if it means this, why am I charged with a "palpable misrepresentation?" Why did not the reviewer produce the texts, or at least declare himself ready to produce them, instead of saying, "We are not concerned with whether there will be a millennium or no, before the Advent."

Digitized by Google

sin, to undo man's ruin, and to restore man's forfeited inheritance. That grace has been exhibiting itself in different forms and aspects through successive ages. These *phases* all divines, without any exception, have been in the habit of calling dispensations; as when they speak of the *patriarchal dispensation*, or the *Mosaic dispensation*, or the *Christian dispensation*. No one has thought of censuring them for this mode of speech, or maintained that to speak of successive dispensations is to lay another foundation than that which is already laid. Why then should we be censured for speaking of the new or millennial dispensation, seeing all divines have done the same?* And why should the expression startle or offend, seeing we mean by it what the soundest of divines have done before us,—a new form of administering that same grace, which has been the basis and the corner-stone of all previous dispensations from the beginning?

And in that coming age or dispensation, the Holy Spirit will occupy precisely the same place, and fulfil the same office as now. When we speak of the Lord's coming as the turning-point of the world's conversion, we do not mean that any outward sign, however portentous, or any miracle, whether of glory or of terror, can suffice to break the stoutness of the human heart, or bend the stubbornness of a human knee. Nothing merely outward, however marvellous, can renew the soul, changing its darkness into light, its hatred into love. We do, indeed, believe that God has reserved the world's conversion and Israel's repentance for the coming of his own Son, as it is written,—"they shall look upon him whom they have pierced, and mourn;" and we believe also that God is to make use of that event, with all its accompaniments of trembling and of gladness, and all its exhibitions of infinite wrath and immeasurable love, for bringing back the heart of an alienated world to himself; but not the less is it to be all the Holy Spirit's work,—the work of that same Spirit by the forth-putting of whose power a soul is now raised from its grave of sin. A nation shall then be born in a day, even as 3000 were in Jerusalem at Pentecost; but still, as heretofore, through the instrumentality of the Divine Word, and the agency of the Divine Spirit. Effectual calling will be then, as it is now, "The work of God's Spirit, whereby, convincing us of our sin and misery,

* President Edwards, speaking of millennial times, uses the very word dispensation to mark them off from preceding ages. "This dispensation is, above all the preceding ones, like Christ's coming to judgment, in that it so puts an end to the former state of the world, and introduces the everlasting Kingdom of Christ."—*History of Redemption*, Per. iii., Part 7.

Digitized by Google

enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ, and renewing our wills, he will persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ freely offered to us in the Gospel;" the same Gospel,—the same "everlasting Gospel," in believing which we are now forgiven,—the Gospel not of one age, but of all ages; not of this age, or of a former age, or of the age to come, but the everlasting Gospel, which abideth the same for ever, and which is now made known to earth's weary sinners, in all its freeness,—that, believing it, they may become heirs of the promised kingdom, and possessors of the endless life which shall fit them for enjoying that kingdom for ever.

In short, there is not one doctrine which we now hold, which shall not *then* be as true as heretofore, and as brightly exemplified in the age to come as in the present. Neither is there any spiritual blessing believed by our opponents to be conferred in millennial times, which we do not also expect. We *diminish* nothing of their store of blessing; we only insist on *adding* somewhat more, which we think God has promised. We efface nothing of the bright picture which they draw, we would only insert new touches, and increase the glory of the scene. They contend for the spiritual. So also do we. Yet we add to this the outward and the palpable. They hold fast the invisible. So also do we. Only we throw around it the visible, as that which God himself declares necessary to its completeness. We abolish not the soul, but we clothe it with the body. We contend for the indwelling of Christ in the heart, but we maintain also his glorious kingdom here on earth, where we shall see his face and hear his voice, when he shall reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously.

I have dwelt at some length on these misapprehensions, because I know that they are prevalent, and that they repel many from the subject who might otherwise be led at least to consider it. I am persuaded, that in many points we are not understood; or rather, we are totally misunderstood. Men will not be at the trouble to ask us what we really believe. They have caught up a few words which may have fallen from us, and on these fragments they have set their own construction, which construction they suppose must form part of our creed.

I trust that there are not a few among our opponents, who are beginning to learn and adopt a more excellent way.

I am, &c., yours,

July, 1849. ———.

Digitized by Google

Notes on Scripture.

Psalm IV.

There is no solid reason for doubting the genuineness of those titles, or inscriptions, that are prefixed to many of the Psalms. They are as ancient as the text of the Psalms themselves. The ancient versions prove that they are no modern addition. If, then, we may put confidence in them, why is it that so frequently these fragmentary marks are so obscure? Every one feels their obscurity; for to this day no criticism has succeeded in satisfactorily shewing the true sense of "On *Neginoth*," and similar terms. *Musical instruments* are almost always referred to in these terms, and though these joyful instruments of holy service have been lost in the ruin of Israel's temple, it is somewhat for us to know that the times of the *true* David and Solomon were typified, as to their manifold streams of joy, by the "*Neginoth*," "*Sheminith*," and similar forms of the harp and psaltery.

The Psalm before us, describing the chief good, was one sung on Zion, in the tabernacle, and afterwards in the temple, on the "*Neginoth*," some stringed instrument, played upon by the stroke of the fingers, or of the musician's plectrum. Its theme was one calling for a joyous instrument.

It is the first Psalm we have found inscribed "*To the Chief Musician*," and there is an interesting propriety in this being the first so inscribed. For its subject being throughout Jehovah as the chief good—Israel's true blessedness—what more fitting than to give it to be sung before all the people by Asaph, the leader of the sacred music in the days of David? (1 Chron. xvi. 5.)* May we not suppose that the "*Chief Musician*" occupied a high place in the typical economy? Was he not used by the Lord to present to Israel Him who is to lead the praise to the great congregation? (Psalm xxii. 25.) When he sang such deeply melancholy Psalms as the twenty-second, was the scene not fitted to bring into the minds of God's people the idea of the suffering Saviour, passing from the unutterable groanings to the joy unspeakable?

This Psalm takes a survey of earth's best enjoyments—the sons of men revelling in the plenty of corn and wine. Their mirth is loud, their mockery of less mirthful ones than themselves is keen, vanity is their pursuit, false joys their fascinations. To such a gay multitude our Psalm represents One approaching who has come from weeping in secret places. (Ver. 1.) Entering their circle, this Righteous One

* The word מְנַצֵּחַ never means "Conqueror," as some have wished to render it. It means always "standing over," as a foreman, and is used only of the arrangements made in regard to the Levites in their courses. (See Hengstenberg, who also quotes Hab. iii. 19.)

Digitized by Google

calls upon them to consider their ways: "*O ye sons of men,*" is his cry, "*how long will ye turn my glory into shame? How long will ye love vanity and seek after lies?*"* When will you leave broken cisterns? When will you turn from the golden calf back to the God of Israel, your glory? A pause ensues—"*Selah*" marks it. It is the silence of one who waits for the effect of his expostulation; but there is no response, and he lifts up his voice again, and leaves his testimony among them: "*But know the Lord hath set apart the godly for himself.*" The Lord keeps the godly; each such man is like the witnesses of Revelation xi. 6: "These have power to shut heaven, and to smite the earth,"—"*The Lord heareth when I call upon him.*" Well then may the sons of men give ear. "Stand in awe—consider—flee to the sacrifices appointed by the *God of my righteousness,*" (ver. 1,) and stay yourselves on Him; for I testify that the experience of all who have tried this plan of happiness has been such that they can answer the question, "*Who can shew us any good?*" by an upward look to Jehovah, "*Lord, lift thou on us the light of thy countenance!*" Yes, (says the speaker to his God, to whom he had cast his upward glance, and by whose look of love he seems detained and riveted,) "Thou *hast put more gladness in my heart than in the time when their corn and wine abound. I lay me down and sleep in peace; for thou, Lord,* (giving me the full portion of Israel dwelling in their land of corn and wine, with its heavens dropping dew, Deut. xxxiii. 28,) *makest me to dwell in safety all alone!*"

There is an undoubted allusion in the last verse, in the לְבָדָד לָבֶטַח to the blessing of Moses in Deut. xxxiii. 28, where Israel's final destiny is declared to be "dwelling בֶּטַח בָּדָד," in undisturbed security, and needing none to help or bless them but Jehovah. In this Psalm the godly one anticipates this as his portion, and so we see him fixing his eye on the *future,* even while at present his gladness is greater far than all earth can yield. The vanity of the sons of men is all the more clearly seen in the additional light of the coming glory.

We can easily understand how any true child of God can use these words—they so exactly delineate his state of feeling toward the world, and toward his God, and toward his fellow-men. But in no lips could they be so appropriate as in His "who spake as never man spake." Indeed, is there not throughout a tone like that of "*Wisdom,*" in Proverbs i. and viii.? The party addressed is the "sons of men," as there; and there is the same expostulatory and anxious voice, "*How long, ye simple ones?*" (i. 22.) "*Hear, for I will speak of excellent things.*" (viii. 6.) We might imagine every syllable of this precious Psalm used by our Master some evening, when about to leave the Temple for the day, and retiring to his wonted rest at Bethany,

* It has been observed, that for the sake of the universal Church in all ages, the psalmist is led by the Holy Ghost to use terms such as "*glory,*" which may apply to what any man values; "*lies,*" which may include under it every degree and species of deception; and "*vanity,*" expressive of those earthly, unsatisfying objects, sought after by rich and poor.

Digitized by Google

(ver. 8,) after another fruitless expostulation with the men of Israel. And we may read it still as the very utterance of his heart, longing over man, and delighting in God.

But in either case, whether we read as the utterance of the Head, or of one of his members in full sympathy with him in holy feeling, this is a Psalm with which the dwellings of the righteous may resound any evening, as they cast a sad look over a world that rejects God's grace. They may sing it as they cling more and more every day to Jehovah, as their all-sufficient heritage, now and in the age to come. They may sing it too in the happy confidence of faith and hope in the evening of this world's day, and may then fall asleep in the certainty of what shall greet their eyes on the resurrection morning—

Sleeping embosomed in his grace
'Till morning-shadows flee.

If, therefore, we were required to state the substance of this Psalm in a few words, we could scarcely err in describing its theme as *The Godly One's Chief Good.*

Psalm V.

Another song of the sweet singer of Israel, handed over to the "Chief Musician," who was to give it to be publicly sung "on the *Nehiloth.*" This was some of the many musical instruments, now unknown, lost to us ever since Israel hung their harp on the willows and had their joy turned into mourning *—though generally understood to be a wind instrument, or pipe, of some sort.

There is in it a prophetic element toward the close. In ver. 10, 11, we have something that closely resembles the Apocalyptic scene in Revelation xix. 1, 3, 4. The psalmist so fully sympathizes in the justice of the doom that is coming on the obstinate and impenitent rebels against God, that he cries aloud, "*Destroy them, O God!*" &c.; or, more exactly, "Hold them guilty, and treat them as such." On the other hand, there arises at the same moment the shout of the righteous, acquiescing with entire satisfaction in their doom: "*And let all those that put their trust in thee, rejoice! Let them ever shout for joy!*" This is their "Hallelujah" over the rising smoke of torment—their "Glory and honour to the Lord our God." And perhaps it is in this manner we are to understand, throughout the Book of Psalms, all those portions where we find, apparently, prayers that breathe revenge. They are never to be thought of as anything else than the *breathed assent of righteous souls* to the justice of their God,

* The idea of Hengstenberg, that this and some others of the titles convey a mystical meaning, or enigmatical sense, is quite fanciful. He renders this, "*On the lots,*" as being a Psalm that exhibits the different lot of righteous and wicked. But is not the *conduct and life* of the two classes exhibited in it, far more than the *lot?* The objection that אֶל is not used with stringed instruments, is a gratuitous assertion; probably אֶל is used, instead of עַל, because of some peculiarity in using the instrument.

who taketh vengeance on sin. When taken as the words of Christ himself, they are no other than an echo of the Intercessor's acquiescence at last in the sentence on the barren fig-tree. It is as if he cried aloud, "Hew it down now—I will intercede no longer—the doom is righteous, *destroy them, O God; cast them out in* (or, for) *the multitude of their transgressions! for they have rebelled against thee.*" And in the same moment he may be supposed to invite his saints to sympathize in his decision; just as in Revelation xviii. 20: "Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets!" In like manner, when one of Christ's members, in entire sympathy with his head, views the barren fig-tree from the same point of observation, and sees the glory of God concerned in inflicting the blow, he too can cry, "Let the axe smite!" Had Abraham stood beside the angel who destroyed Sodom, and seen how Jehovah's name required the ruin of these impenitent rebels, he would have cried out, "Let the shower descend—let the fire and brimstone come down!" not in any spirit of revenge—not from want of tender love to souls—but from intense earnestness of concern for the glory of his God.

We consider this explanation to be the real key that opens all the difficult passages in this book, where curses seem to be called for on the head of the ungodly. They are no more than a carrying out of Deut. xxvii. 15—26,—"Let all the people say, Amen," and an entering into the holy abhorrence of sin and delight in acts of justice expressed in the "Amen, hallelujah," of Rev. xix. 3.

But let us read the whole Psalm, and we may notice that in it occur, for the first time, "My *King* and my *God.*" On this Augustine remarks, "Recte primo '*Rex meus,*' et deinde '*Deus meus,*' secundum illud quod dictum est, 'Per me itur ad Patrem.'" He that is peculiarly "king" to Israel is on Israel's side.

We seem to see One going up to the Tabernacle early, in prospect of the morning sacrifice. It is near the time; the priest is already at the altar, setting the wood in order, and the Lamb is bound to the altar's horns; the worshipper's eye and heart are upward,—"Give ear to my words, O Lord, consider my *silent prayer*" (ver. 1), a prayer made up of the "unutterable groanings" (Rom. viii. 26), and which can be heard, as well as presented, while he stands amid the crowd that are gathering in the courts. "My voice shalt thou hear in the morning" (ver. 3) is the expression of a resolution habitually to come before him early,—"My earliest cry shall always be to thee; in the morning will I direct my (spiritual) offering unto thee, and will look up (Hengstenberg) to that house of prayer where stand the altar and the mercy-seat, and where God is revealed in grace." The altar presents "God reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto men their trespasses." Jehovah's look of love is there; his voice is love from its four horns; everything tells man of grace.

But how careless are those around this worshipper; some coming up to the altar to lull their conscience asleep by the formality of a visit to the courts of God; others hurrying off to their earthly pursuits. This leads him to meditate before God on the "world

Digitized by Google

lying in wickedness" (vers. 4—9), interposing his own resolute determination to be unlike that world (ver. 7) by the help of Jehovah (ver. 8). A "*dwelling with God*" is what his righteous soul relishes and revels in the enjoyment of, and the want of this he reckons to be the misery of the ungodly. (Ver. 4.) This is the very spirit of the beloved John (1 John iv. 16),—"He that dwelleth in love, *dwelleth in God*, and God in him;" and the resemblance is all the closer when we find ver. 7 speak of his coming "*in the multitude of thy mercy*," or "greatness of thy love," to worship in Jehovah's "Holy Temple."

It is after this that he is led into such deep sympathy with the holy purposes and righteous sentences of Jehovah, in whose love he dwells, as to cry, "Destroy them, O God," &c. And we leave him singing with assured confidence, "For thou, O Lord, wilt bless the righteous; with favour thou wilt compass him, as with a shield."

It is a Psalm which Messiah could use most fully; none could ever use it so fully as He. Think of Him, some morning leaving Bethany early that He may be in time for the morning sacrifice, and breathing forth this Psalm by the way and as He entered the Temple-courts. Every word of it becomes doubly emphatic in his lips, down to the last verse, where we see Him as "*the* Righteous One," encompassed with the Father's love and well-pleasedness. But whether we read it as peculiarly the utterance of Messiah, or as that of one of his members, we may describe this Psalm as being

The Righteous One's thoughts of God and of man while going up to the morning sacrifice.

Psalm VI.

Hitherto, the harp of Judah and the sacred instruments of varied chords have sounded little concerning the Just One's inward sorrows. But now the psalmist points "the Chief Musician" to the "*Neginoth*," mentioned in Psalm iv., and at the same time to "*Sheminith*,"* some eight-stringed instrument, as if both together must be used for a theme so intensely melancholy as these verses handle.

We may at once say to the reader, This is not David, it is the Son of David; the grief is too deep for any other,—

"*You never saw a vessel of like sorrow.*"

David may have been led by the Holy Ghost to write it when in anguish of soul, as well as suffering of body; through such a bruised reed the Spirit of God may have breathed. But surely he meant to tell of One greater than David,—"*the Man of sorrows.*" Perhaps David had some seasons of anguish in his wanderings in the wilderness of Judah that furnished a shadow of the grief of Him who was to come, "bearing our griefs and carrying our sorrows;"

* Augustine has a long passage in which he discusses the question, whether there is any reference to the *Last Day* in the number "*eight;*" and is inclined to think that the Eternal Day may be meant. "Quoniam omnia tempora septem dierum istorum repetitione volvuntur, *octavus* forte ille dilectus est qui varietatem istam non habebit."

Digitized by Google

and believers still feel, from peculiar causes, occasional glooms that may be expressed in the words of this Psalm more fitly than any other. Still, it is chiefly of the true David that this is written. We may suppose every word used by Him in some of those nights He passed in desert places, or in the Garden of Gethsemane.

What cries are these? "*Lord, rebuke me not in thy wrath.*" Is not this the same voice that cried, "Father, if it be possible, remove this cup from me"? Again: "*Have mercy upon me, O Lord, for I am weak.*" Is not this the same who said, "The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is *weak?*" (Matt. xxvi. 31.) We listen, and again He cries, "*My soul is sore vexed.*" Is it not the voice of Him who, as He entered the garden, spoke with such affecting sadness to his disciples, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful"? (Matt. xxvi. 38.) Yes, He said, "*even unto death.*" And in this psalm we hear Him tell some of his forebodings of death. It seems to be the very hour referred to in Heb. vi. 7,—the hour of "strong crying and tears to Him who was able to save him from death." For here are his strong reasonings with God,—"In death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave, who shall give thee thanks?"—an expostulation undoubtedly such as a member of Christ could use, for Hezekiah used it (Isa. xxxviii. 18), pleading that, if taken away, he could do no more for the making known God's name and glory among men. But how forcible in the lips of Jesus! If he be given over to death, *i.e.*, left under its power, then neither He, nor any one of all those whom the Father had given Him, can ever give praise.

The dark night becomes darker. It is midnight. "*I am weary with my groaning. Mine eye is consumed with grief.* It waxes old, because of all mine enemies.*" On his brow, anguish had shed more snows (it has been said) than threescore winters, in their natural course, might else have sprinkled there. (John viii. 57.) But all at once there is a change. *The angel from heaven strengthens Him.* (Luke xxii. 43.) He is revived by the Father's promise, "I have glorified thee, and will glorify thee again." He sees his foes "confounded and greatly terrified" by the look of that very countenance they once could spit upon (ver. 10): "It is like." (1 Thess. v. 10.)

It is only at this one point that this Psalm presents anything bearing on the prophetic future. But certainly it does at this turn present us with a glimpse of the *Second Coming* of Him whose First Coming was so full of woe. "The voice of the turtle is heard again," says a German commentator; and truly it is so. For, at ver. 8, the Suffering One sees "the glory that is to follow," and exclaims, "*Depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity,*" words which are employed by himself in Luke xiii. 27, in describing the terms in which, as judge, He will address the multitudes of the unsaved on the Great Day, when He has risen up and has shut to the door.

Was it not designed that this ending should draw more attention to

* "The eye is the mirror and guage of soundness, not merely as respects the soul, but the body also," says a well-known commentator.

Digitized by Google

the beginning! Let the sinner now consider the Suffering One, lest the sentence pass on him, "Depart." Come, and see here what a price was paid for the soul's redemption; and if you have felt anguish of spirit under a sense of deserved wrath, let it cease now, when you find the Man of sorrows presenting all his anguish as the atonement for your soul. Thus will the reader use aright this most pathetic Psalm, in meditating on which he is shown—

The comfortless couch of the Righteous One.

ANALYSIS OF 1 COR. XV., AND DISSERTATION ON 1 COR. XV. 27, 28.

Translated from the Latin of Rutger Schutte, Minister of the Gospel at Amsterdam, in the "Bibliotheca Hagana," vol. i., for 1768.

*** The article has been slightly abridged by the Translator, especially in some passages referring to the opinions of contemporary authors.

Analysis of 1 Cor. XV.

After an introduction contained in the first two verses, the Apostle

I. Defends the doctrine of the Resurrection against the Epicurean Gnostics. (Vers. 3—34.)

1. He proves the resurrection of Christ. (Vers. 3—11.)

2. And thence draws arguments for the resurrection of the faithful which are directly opposed to the fancies of the Gnostics. (Vers. 12—32.)

(1.) He argues from the absurd consequences which would result if the opinions of the Gnostics were true. (Vers. 12—19.)

(2.) He contends that the dead must be raised from the opposition between the first and second Adam. (Vers. 20—22.)

(3.) He demonstrates the resurrection from the conflicts and victory both of Christ and of believers. (Vers. 23—32.)

First, from the conflicts and victory of Christ over all enemies, and even over death itself. (Vers. 23—28.) Here he describes Him

A. As a general, who, having risen in his own order, *ταγματι*, has given the fullest assurance that his whole army shall also rise, each in their proper order, and enjoy a triumph. (Ver. 23.)

B. As a general, who, at the end of a war in which he has conquered all his enemies, shall assuredly receive a triumph. (Vers. 24—28.) He here treats of

a. The victories of Christ and the destruction of his enemies. (Vers. 24—26.)

b. The arrangement of the triumphal procession after all his enemies have been overthrown. (Vers. 27, 28.) And on this point he notices,—

(*a.*) That all things are subordinated to the Son as commander-in-chief, God alone being excepted; and this he notices against the Gnostics. (Ver. 27.)

(*b*.) That the Son, after this subordination of all things, is himself subordinated to the Father as chief magistrate, that God may be all and in all. (Ver. 28.)

Secondly, he demonstrates the resurrection from the conflicts and victory of believers in their war against the enemies of the Church. (Vers. 29—32.) He shows that this doctrine is to be believed.

A. Because in the room of those who have been slain, new soldiers press forward to enlist for Christ. (Ver. 29.)

B. Because with indomitable courage they endure the worst perils of war, and even fight with wild beasts. (Vers. 30—32.)

3. The apostle adds certain useful admonitions for behoof of the Corinthians. (Vers. 33, 34.)

II. He explains the subject further, and replies to the difficulties started by the Gnostics. (Vers. 35—54.) Here he treats,—

1. Of the believers who shall be dead before the Day of Judgment. (Vers. 35—49.) On this subject, having in ver. 36 stated the two great Gnostic difficulties, he answers them separately.

(1.) To the first difficulty, "How shall the dead rise?" he answers shortly, that death is the way to life. (Ver. 36.)

(2.) To the second difficulty, "With what body shall they come?" he replies more at length (vers. 37—49),—

First, he shows that there are great differences between different kinds of bodies. (Vers. 37—41.)

Secondly, he applies this to the bodies of those who shall rise. (Vers. 42—49.)

A. He explains how their bodies shall be changed. (Vers. 42—44.)

B. He confirms his view from the opposition between the first and second Adam, inasmuch as the natural body has its origin from the former, the spiritual from the latter. (Vers. 45—49.)

2. He treats of believers who shall be alive at the Day of Judgment, showing that they shall be changed. (Vers. 50—54.)

III. He sings a song of triumph, and so closes the discussion. (Vers. 55—58.)

Dissertation on 1 Corinthians XV. 27, 28.

In order to understand, with the help of the preceding analysis, this passage of Paul, so much handled by commentators, it is necessary to observe that the word ὑποτασσειν is borrowed from the military terms of the ancients. Zeltner, the theologian of Altorf, has already noticed that it is from this source that the word takes the meaning rather of *subordination* than *subjection*, and thus signifies, "to succeed another in a certain order," "immediately to follow him." Paul appears to me to employ in this place a continuous metaphor, almost running into an allegory, adopting from the military art of the ancients individual phrases and almost every one of his terms. He represents believers as an army triumphing at the last day under their commander-in-

chief, or ἀρχηγος, Christ; who shall be at the head of this army, when he shall lead into heaven his victorious troops.

I. To go a little farther into this matter, this signification of the word ὑποτασσειν is supported by the use, in the twenty-third verse, of the military term ταγμα. For it is unnecessary to prove that this latter word is especially used of the ranks of soldiers. We need only quote the "Tactica" of Arrian,*—"And these are divided into *ranks*, ταγματα, each of which has its own peculiar name."

II. This sense is called for by the beautiful passage from Ps. cx. 2, quoted by the apostle in verse 25, where there is an evident allusion to the military affairs of the Hebrews, as, *e. g.*, when the willing army of the Messiah is spoken of, and his soldiers in the dew of their youth. Hence arises the mention of enemies (ἐχθροι), who are to be conquered, subjected, and caused to cease from opposition. In this sense the LXX. use the word καταργειν in Ezra iv. 23. Και κατηργησαν ἀυτους ἐν ἱπποις και δυναμει; and the Chaldee accurately expresses it by בטל, "to make to rest." To which answers the Latin phrase, *Quiescere pugnæ*, used by Q. Claudius.†

III. Moreover, the General of the heavenly army is here, by the same metaphor, called a king, βασιλευς; a kingdom, βασιλεια, is ascribed to him; and he is said to reign, βασιλευειν. (Vers. 24, 25.) For by that name the Greeks were wont to call the commander-in-chief of an army, who conducted the war. Orbicius, who wrote a little book, Περι των ταξεων,‡ tells us this in express words: "He who is over the whole army is called *king*, βασιλευς." So also Diodorus Siculus: § "It was the custom of the Roman soldiers, if their general had in battle slain above five thousand of the enemy, to salute him by the title of *Imperator*, that is, *king*, βασιλευς." Hence, we may illustrate that remarkable passage, Rev. ix. 11: "And they have over them a king, βασιλεα, the angel of the abyss." And unless this use of the term be observed, it is impossible to understand the language of Pollux; ‖ for, in giving the titles of those who bore rule at Athens, he first names the archon, then the *king*, then the polemarch. The king, βασιλευς, was, in truth, the commander-in-chief, and the polemarch the general under him.

IV. To these add the phrase taken from the same source, παραδουναι βασιλειαν. (Ver. 24.) Herodotus uses the word παραδουναι for the delivering up of a country subjugated by war. "The Persians, when they had spoiled Samos, delivered it (παρεδωσαν) to Syloson deserted by its inhabitants," ¶ namely, to be ruled by him, for he was an intimate friend of the Persian monarch. A little before he uses ἀποδουναι for παραδουναι.** But in the previous chapter he again uses παραδουναι, where he says of Maeander, "Having irritated the Persians, he wished to weaken the state of Samos, and thus *hand it*

* Page 28. † I. Annal. apud Gell. Noct. Attic., lib. ix., c. 13.

‡ This treatise is to be found in the Appendix to Scapula's Lexicon, col. 71 of the London Edition. § Eclog. iii. of lib. xxxvi.

‖ Onom., lib. viii., c. ix. § 85. ¶ Lib. iii., c. 149.

** Lib. iii., c. 147.

Digitized by Google

over." Syloson himself uses the simple δουναι: "But when you have saved Samos, my native island, give it to me."* In these passages παραδουναι signifies the free gift of an island subjugated and saved, made to an inferior by one greatly his superior, namely, by the great king of the Persians. But, in the text before us, I take the word in the sense of *handing over* both the *imperatorial* power, and the possession conquered and rescued from enemies, which the Son, the conductor of the war (*dux belli*), and the illustrious Conqueror of the devil and hell, offers to the Father. The *kingdom,* βασιλεια, is not a civil, but a military kingdom, viz., the imperatorial rule, or *praetura,* which, as βασιλευς, the commander-in-chief has obtained. For truly the Son shall not deliver up his *civil* kingdom to the Father; such an act would be incongruous, and would not be easily reconciled with the Divine promises of the eternal duration of that kingdom. (See 2 Sam. vii. 13; Dan. ii. 44; vii. 14; Luke i. 33; 2 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Pet. i. 11; Rev. xi. 15.) He shall deliver up his military kingdom, or *imperium,*—his imperatorial power, when he shall have set free his own people from their enemies, who are here in express terms called "all rule, αρχη,† and authority, εξουσια,‡ and power, δυναμις." § (Comp. Ps. ii. 9, 10.) Each of these words is taken from the *imperium,* and from the Greek and Roman military terms, a plain proof, if I mistake not, that the βασιλεια which Christ shall deliver up to the Father is that which the Romans call *imperium,* just as βασιλευς answers, as I have shown above, to the Latin *imperator.* ‖ And thus, not He who has subjugated those kingdoms and powers, but those who are conquered, as is most just, and indeed demanded by the very nature of the thing, are deprived of the kingdom.

That these things, which are already manifest in their own light, may be yet more clearly understood, let it be observed, that the words of the twenty-fourth verse are, in my judgment, so connected as that όταν καταργηση is not to be immediately referred to ἐιτα το τελος, as though nothing was interposed, but with the intervention of the clause, όταν παραδῳ την βασιλειαν τῳ Θεῳ και Πατρι, upon which the last words of the verse immediately depend. The paragraph is to be pointed and rendered thus:—"Then shall be the end; when he shall deliver up the imperatorial power to God and the Father, after he has

* Lib. iii., c. 140.

† Ἀρχη signifies "kings or princes" themselves. Διαδεξασθαι την ἀρχην and διαδεξασθαι την βασιλειαν are continually used by Diodorus Siculus as convertible terms. Lib. i., c. 59, c. 63, c. 64. Herodian, lib. iii. c. 3, § 13.

‡ I understand ἐξουσια as the highest authority after the imperator, or king. Herodian, in the passage just quoted, distinguishes ἐξουσια from ἀρχη; and he mentions also ατικας ἐξουσιας. Lib. v. c. 7, § 14.

§ Δυναμις very frequently signifies the same as *vires regni* among the Romans, the army, or forces, of the *imperium.* See Polyaen. Stratag., lib. i., c. 39, § 3; lib. iii., c. 52. Polyb. Hist., lib. v., c. 33. Herodian, Hist., lib. i., c. 6, § 18; lib. ii., c. 13, § 10, &c., &c.

‖ Dio calls him ἀυτοκρατορα. Hence, Tiberius would not suffer himself to be called *dominus* by a freeman, nor *imperator,* ἀυτοκρατορα, unless by the soldiers. Dion. Hist., lib. lvii., c. 8.

Digitized by Google

put down all rule and all authority and power." The end of this long war and of all things shall be in the last times, when Christ shall deliver up his imperatorial power, along with his faithful soldiers, now secure from any further hostile invasion, to the supreme God and Father. It was a common opinion in those days that the end of all things was at hand. The Gnostics made use of it to defend their erroneous opinion that the dead were not to be raised; contending, inasmuch as the end of all things was close at hand, either that no resurrection of the dead was to be looked for, or, if they did not dare to put forth an opinion so manifestly opposed to Scripture and to the sayings of Christ himself, endeavouring to persuade others that it was already passed and was to be understood mystically. (See 2 Tim. ii. 18.) This error the apostle opposes in this place, and shows that this delivering up shall be *after* Christ, the king and general of the heavenly army, shall have reduced to peace the whole infernal empire, all principality, all power, ranking next to principality, in fine, the whole forces of the hostile kingdoms. The very nature of the thing proves indeed that the *imperium* cannot be delivered to the heavenly Father until the hostile army is subdued, and all the *imperium* therein existing shall be entirely done away. Therefore, I conceive that the kingdom, *βασιλεια*, is to be explained both of the imperatorial power and also of the army of this imperator. The word *παραδουναι* is often used of the delivering up of a generalship (*imperii*), or a prætorship, (*præturæ*), in such a manner, that not only the imperatorial or royal power, but also the very soldiers and subjects, are to be understood as comprehended in it. And the very nature of these things shows that they are so closely connected that they can only be separated in thought. For what, I ask, is an *imperium* without an army, or a kingdom without subjects? So Thucydides uses the words *πάρα διδοναι την αρχην* of the *prætura*, or imperatorial power, which among the Athenians Nicias gave up to Cleon. "But when he knew that he really wished to surrender it" (*Γνους δε ὀντι παραδωσειοντα*).* And a little after, "But the more that Cleon declined the voyage, and refused to stand by his promises, the more did they insist that Nicias should give up to him the command" (*παραδιδοναι την ἀρχην*). And in another passage he uses the word *παραδωσις* in the same way. "In surrendering the sceptre he said," (*Εν του σκηπτρου ἁμα τῃ παραδωσει ἑιρηκεν*).† The Scholiast on Homer applies the apostle's phrase in the same sense. "Atreus, on the approach of death, desiring to be reconciled to his brother, surrendered to him the kingdom (*παραδιδωσιν ἀυτῳ την βασιλειαν*) that he might hand it over to Agamemnon when he grew up." ‡ Herodianus, too, connects the words *βασιλεια* and *παραδοθηναι* in the same sentence, almost in the same way as the Apostle Paul; for he thus writes of the Emperors Antoninus and Geta:—"Having assembled their paternal friends, and in the presence of their mother, they resolved to divide the *kingdom*, *βασιλειαν*, in such manner that all Europe might belong to Antoninus, and the

* Hist., lib. ii., c. 28. † Hist., lib. i., c. 9. ‡ On Iliad, b. ii. v. 107.

Digitized by Google

opposite continent, by name Asia, might be delivered, παραδοθηναι, to Geta."* He first uses "kingdom" as a generic term, and then divides it into two parts, Europe and Asia, including, of course, the inhabitants of both. The same author elsewhere uses βασιλεια of the empire and its inhabitants.† In the same sense it is to be met with in the sacred writings, as in Matt. xii. 25; xiii. 31, &c.; xviii. 1; xxiv. 7; Col. i. 13. The meaning, therefore, of παραδιδοναι βασιλειαν, if I mistake not, is the following: "To deliver up the generalship of the war, while at the same time Christ acknowledges that the Church of the whole world, which he received from God, and has now increased to its utmost bounds by the overthrow of the tyranny of its enemies, belongs to God alone, from whom he asks liberty to hold a triumph." As of old, the generals who had defeated the forces of the enemy, and extended the bounds of the Roman dominions, not only informed the senate by letters of the numbers of the enemy and of the citizens slain in battle, but also, when they first entered the city, were obliged to swear before the urban quæstors that they had given a true account to the senate. This might suitably be called the delivering up of the command, all rule and authority and power having been put down.

V. Finally, βασιλευειν, in verse 25, denotes, "to hold the office of an *imperator*; to retain that office by power, and defend it by arms," a thing which belongs to the militant kingdom of grace, inasmuch as we have still to struggle with many enemies. In this sense the word appears to be used by Herodian, who introduces Antoninus, declaring to Artabanus, king of the Persians, that the Romans would easily retain under one diadem the empire of the whole world,‡ ὑφ' ἑνι διαδηματι βασιλευσειν πασης οἰκουμενης. In the same way is the passage before us to be rendered, "He must retain the *imperium* until he hath put all enemies under his feet." Here the phrase is τιθεναι ὑπο τους ποδους, and not ὑποτασσειν, for the allusion is to the manner in which conquered enemies were trampled under the feet of their conquerors.

> Crinibus en etiam fertur Germania passis,
> Et ducis invicti sub pede moesta sedet.
>
> *Ovid*, *Trist.*, lib. iv., Eleg. ii., v. 43, 44.

This sense is demanded, not merely by the context in this place, but also by the 110th Psalm. For the reign of the Messiah, and his session at the right hand of his Father, who carries on the war for him, are described in vers. 1, 3, and 5, in a manner which does not in any way accord with a military kingdom.

VI. Lastly, the words of the twenty-sixth verse, "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death," plainly have regard to a *war*, and a *triumph*. He who falls in battle, even though he die for his country, is deemed to have been conquered by death. But here death itself is conquered. Here the army of the faithful is described as triumphing, and entering into the heavenly capitol; while death, like a captive

* Lib. iv., c. 3, § 10, 11. † Lib. vi., c. 2, § 1.
‡ Lib. iv. c. 10, § 8.

Digitized by Google

general, is handed over to final punishment in a worse than Tullian prison-house. For the goal of the triumphal procession was the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus; and when they arrived there, they were wont to wait for a short time, until the death of the captive general was announced, whose throat was cut by a lictor in the prison-house. Perhaps in this verse, as well as in the preceding, the apostle had in his mind the 110th Psalm, which closes with these words,—"He shall drink of the brook in the way, therefore shall he lift up the head." I am of opinion that David here refers to the brook Cedron, which, among the Hebrew poets, was the river Lethe, or stream of the infernal regions, and is often in the sacred writings called simply, נחל, or "the brook,"* a mode of speech employed, so far as I know, in regard to no other stream. Here, therefore, the death of Messiah is described, and the victory which he obtained over death. S. Bochart, in his "Letters to Tapinus,"† rightly observes, in my opinion, that this Psalm has to do with the royal and priestly offices of the Messiah; that the first three verses describe his vocation to the office of a king; the fourth his calling to that of a priest, while the fifth and sixth relate his administration of his kingdom, and the seventh of his priesthood. The connexion of the verses of the Psalm could not be better pointed out. But if in the seventh verse the prophet does not speak of the death of Messiah, as many think, then in the fifth and sixth verses he describes the administration of his kingly office, and does not even by a word allude to the administration of his priestly office; and that although he had mentioned in the fourth verse his call to that office. This seems to me very improbable. If, on the other hand, we explain the seventh verse of the death of Christ in the discharge of his priesthood, then all parts of the Psalm excellently cohere; for, in order that he might remain a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec, it behoved him to die as was prefigured by the high priest of the Aaronic priesthood.‡

(To be continued.)

Zechariah ix. 1.

"When the eyes of man, as of all the tribes of Israel, shall be toward the Lord."

There seems to be a reference in these words to chap. iii. 9, 10. In that passage Israel is spoken of as looking to the engraved "stone." On that stone are "seven eyes;" every eye in the land, the *fulness* of vision, is fixed on the marvellous stone. Now this stone is the great corner-stone of the Lord's temple—it is the Lord Jesus, the stone long rejected by Israel. While they rejected Him, the iniquity of the land was heavy; the calamities of the land were great and unmitigated; none sat, as in Solomon's days, under their vine and fig-tree, but all

* See 2 Chron. xxxii. 4; Neh. ii. 15; and Ps. cxxiv. 4.

† Appended to his Phal. and Can.

‡ This view of the last verse of Ps. cx. cannot, we think, be supported by sound criticism. (Transl.)

Digitized by Google

trembled with faintness of heart. No sooner, however, do they turn their eyes to that stone, fixed in admiration, astonished at his beauty, than the iniquity of the land is removed in one day, and prosperity returns; they sit under their vines and fig-trees, as in the days of Solomon.

Now, a time is spoken of in chap. ix. 1, when "the *eyes of men*" shall thus be turned to Israel's Jehovah, even as *Israel's tribes* have now turned their eyes to their long-rejected Lord. The events that lead to that consummation are described in what follows; but this verse is meant to direct us as to the period of our world's history when they shall occur.

Matthew xi. 28.

"Come unto me, and I will give you rest."

Even in this free Gospel call to sinners, we find a reference to more than present deliverance. This "*rest*" contains in it more than merely freedom from the harassment and disquiet of present fear and weariness. It speaks of admission into a glorious mansion of grace, where the sinner may repose on the love of God; in which mansion there is, (1) *immediate rest*, guilt being away, and love shed abroad in his heart; (2), A *farther rest*, as the soul increases in sanctification; (3), A *future rest* in the kingdom, when Christ our "rest shall be glorious." We might have interposed also the rest of the soul in Paradise; for Revelation xiv. 13 uses "*rest*" of their blessedness.

It is interesting to find in Mark vi. 31, a kind of typical illustration of our Lord's words, "Come unto me, and I will give you rest:" *δεῦτε προς με, καγω ἀκαπαυσω ὑμᾶς*. Our Lord receives the apostles after their journeyings in Galilee. They come and tell what they had taught, and what they had done. He approves of their services, and invites them to go alone with him to a desert place—to some grassy pasture, where they may sit together, undisturbed, "the Lamb in the midst." His words on this occasion are, "*Δεῦτε ὑμεις αὐτοι . . . . και αναπαυεσθε*," *come and rest*. In reality, there is a resemblance to our first entering into rest in all our after-refreshments. These refreshments occur after weariness, they come from the same kind Giver of rest, they are given as freely as at the first, and received by us as undeservedly; and even so when we shall enter into the *rest* of *glory* at his appearing.

It is further interesting to find our Lord, in Matthew xxv. 34, in the day of his appearing and kingdom, using the same term in inviting his saints to enter on full *possession*, as he did when he first called them to enjoy their *title* to it. "*Come*, ye blessed,"—*Δεῦτε*. In all the cases it is "*hither!*" (*δεῦτε*), they are summoned, viz., to *Himself* most specially; and through Him to all the blessings of which he is the centre. The truth is, that in the very first moment we come to Christ, in the very first moment of believing, we taste the water

Digitized by Google

of eternal life; every time thereafter we go to him anew, we get another draught of the same living water; and when we shall enter the kingdom, the essence of it shall still be that same water of life, drank at the fountain. The glory of the kingdom, the external beauty of the new earth and heavens, the songs of rejoicing, yea, the beauty of the King himself, shall all lead us to that fountain of life as the very heart of joy and bliss. "*Come unto me, and I will give you rest,*" is getting repeated fulfilments up till the hour when the full rest is entered on; but it is the same object that imparts the rest here in the desert, and yonder in the kingdom, viz., the Person who said to us "*come,*" the Prince of Peace.

THE DOUBLE FULFILMENT OF PROPHECY.

THE Bible is unlike all other books; every page bears on it the mark of inspiration. Take its biography; how unlike all biography written by human pen, guided alone by human mind! Where can we find a biographer who does not wish to cast a veil over the faults of him of whom he writes? But we know it is not so with the biographers of the Scripture. Then, again, biography of our writing is not stamped with that typical character so frequently met with in that of Scripture. They of whom we tell are not in their character, their experience, their acts, the circumstances that befel them, representatives of some *one* who is yet to appear, to act his part on the stage of earth's history, and in his single character to combine the varied characters of those of whom we have told, and again act in a superior manner what has been pre-acted by them: of one in whose lifetime circumstances dependent on others will occur, similar to those that have happened to them, and whose innermost feelings of mind and spirit will correspond with the feelings of those whose minds we have ourselves pourtrayed. Now this peculiarity distinguishes the biography of the Bible—the biography of every person in the Old Testament who was a type of our Lord Jesus Christ proves it to us.

Then take its history. This, too, unlike all others, in telling, as they do, of the rise and fall of nations, reveals the real secret of their prosperity—their decline; the hidden causes that worked in bringing both to pass: and why? Because He at whose word nations are planted and built up, destroyed and plucked up, has indited every historic line, guided every pen, that of Moses and Joshua, and each of the Bible historians. Yes, in the Scripture we have the true philosophy of history, and the historians of our day would do well to learn more of such philosophy than they have done.

And take its prophecies; are they like all those which men have attempted—dark and obscure, unintelligible, enigmatical, capable of being applied to any event that may occur from their studiously indefinite meaning? Such were the oracles of old, such the sybilline leaves, but not such is the character of Bible prophecy, *it* is a "sure word," a light that shineth in a dark place; so sure that none can

Digitized by Google

gainsay the prophecy when the event comes to pass, none can complain of walking in darkness—of being obliged to grope their way through thick darkness, for bright is the light cast on the future from every prophetic word.

But it possesses another peculiarity. While foretelling to the very minutest particular the event predicted, that same prophecy also tells of another event still more remote, perhaps,—sometimes, of one still farther, so that often throughout the prophetic Scriptures some particular event is a matter of prophecy, which event again is a shadowing forth of another, still more remote, which is the ultimate end of the prophecy in question. This has been called the double fulfilment of prophecy, and to this I would call the attention of my readers in the following pages. I believe there is much more of this double fulfilment of prophecy scattered throughout Scripture than is generally discerned. I believe, too, that this looking for God's mind in *full*, his entire purpose as declared in every prophetic word, is not a speculative study, a profitless pursuit, for we have landmarks to guide us every step of the way.

We have the *time* the prophecy was spoken, the connexion in which it stands on the prophetic page, the event announced as fulfilling it; all these are our landmarks; and let us now, while I dwell in turn on quotations from the prophets by the New Testament writers, made by them when certain events took place, which happened "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken," by this or that prophet, keep these landmarks steadily in view, and may the Lord the Spirit, by whom holy men of God spake as they were moved, be with us, to teach us all things, to lead us into all truth.

No. I.—The Recall.

Matthew ii. 14, 15, *with Hosea* xi. 1.

By taking the words of the apostle and the prophet in connexion one with another, we have here a proof not to be disproved, of the double fulfilment of prophecy; the Evangelist, when narrating our Lord's being carried into Egypt, and his being brought up out of it, says that this event in the life of Jesus took place, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, "Out of Egypt have I called my son." Now, let us turn to Hosea; from the evident connexion of the passage, we find the words quoted by St. Matthew, are spoken by the prophet of the house of Israel, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him and called my son out of Egypt. As they called them," &c. Now, how can we reconcile the prophet and the Evangelist, except by acknowledging the double fulfilment of prophecy. Let us not for one moment suppose, that St. Matthew accommodated the prophet's words to the event in the life of Jesus,—for fulfilment by accommodation is no fulfilment. No, but the Holy Spirit, who spoke by Hosea, spoke also by Matthew, and pointed out by him what was intended in the prophecy of the former,—pointed out

Digitized by Google

by him the full sense of the words he put into the prophet's mouth. Now, can we not discover from another prophecy, the key to the prediction before us? In Isaiah xlix. 3, the Lord Jesus is addressed by Jehovah, by the name of Israel, "Thou art my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified." And well may Jesus be called by the name of Israel; if his prototype was Jehovah's Son, his first-born, how much more is he?—if Jacob of old was surnamed Israel, because as a prince he had power with God and with man, and had prevailed, how much more may He who is the prince of the kings of the earth,—how much more may He, who is daily and hourly manifesting forth His power both with men and with God, who is our great intercessor hourly, momentarily prevailing with the Most High for us!

Thus we can perceive great beauty and fitness in applying these words of Hosea to our Lord; and I would not alone take the clause, "Out of Egypt have I called my son," as applicable to Him; may we not also apply the words, "when Israel was a child, then I loved him," to the Babe of Bethlehem? Oh, yes! mystery of mysteries—the Son of God was once a little child; and when a child, beloved of his Father,—loved by him supremely, loved by him with an intensity, which even the gushing forth of the tenderest father's heart can hardly convey to us an idea of what the love of God the Father was for *his* Israel, when yet a child. The Evangelist gives us a slight intimation of this, when he says of the child Jesus, "He increased in favour with God;" so that we may learn from those words, that not only was Jesus loved by the Father as a child, but that that love for him was ever increasing, ever growing, in proportion as the Father saw his own image reflected forth more and more in the growing *manhood* of his well-beloved Son. Well may we exclaim, "great is the mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh."

No. II.—The Lament.

Matthew ii. 17, 18. *Jeremiah* xxxi. 15.

The history of Herod's cruel massacre of the little ones of Bethlehem and the coasts thereof is familiar to all. So also is the comment of the inspired historian—"Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, In Ramah was there a voice heard, lamentation and weeping and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not."

By a beautiful figure of the prophets, the cries of the daughter of Benjamin, and of their sisters the daughters of Judah, reach even unto Ramah, near which Rachel was buried; and she, as it were, rises from her grave, and joins them in their lamentations for their slaughtered offspring; this has been considered the reason why Rachel is here mentioned in connexion with Ramah; but though, without doubt, this prophecy of Jeremiah's was, as Matthew notifies, fulfilled in the time of Herod, yet from the period at which it was uttered—from the connexion in which it stands, I cannot but believe that it is to meet with a

Digitized by Google

still fuller accomplishment. The thirty-first chapter of the book of Jéremiah is a continuation of the prophecy of Israel and Judah's final restoration to their own land, which commences at chapter xxx.

It was declared by the prophet, about two years after Jerusalem was taken, in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon. *Then* also was there heard the voice of mourning in Ramah; for from chapter xl., we find that it was at that place that the captives were disposed of by Nebuzaradan, the captain of the King of Babylon's guard; and the lamentation of the captive daughters of Benjamin and Judah may well be supposed to have found an echo in Rachel's tomb. But this poetic language of the prophet is not to be restricted to the events already alluded to. Rachel being the mother of Benjamin, who is always classed with Judah, and of Joseph, whose son Ephraim is the representative of the ten tribes,—is here fitly designated as the mother of the whole house of Israel. Judah and Israel are now scattered throughout all lands,—they are God's banished ones, and Rachel may well be said to bewail the loss of her children; but she is not left without comfort, she is assured that a day will come, when they shall be restored to her again; for "thus saith the Lord, Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears, for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord: and they shall come again from the land of the enemy. And there is hope in thine end, saith the Lord, that thy children shall come again to thine own border." (Verses 16, 17.) How similar are the words of Isaiah, chap. xlix.! Here we have the Lord calling upon all creation to rejoice,—"Sing, O heavens; and be joyful, O earth; and break forth into singing, O mountains." And why? "For the Lord hath comforted his people, and will have mercy upon his afflicted." Then Zion is represented as saying, "The Lord hath forsaken me, and my Lord hath forgotten me;" and then we have that touching answer of her God: appealing to the heart's tenderest affections, he adds, "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? yea, they may forget, yet will not I forget thee."

Then, I think, we have almost a parallel to the words of Jeremiah: "Thy children shall make haste; the children which thou shalt have after thou hast *lost* the other, shall say again in thine ears, The place is too strait for us, give place to me that I may dwell. Then shalt thou say in thine heart, Who hath begotten me these, seeing I have lost my children and am desolate, a captive and removing to and fro? and who hath brought up these? Behold, I was left alone; these, where had they been." I said this was a parallel to Jeremiah, perhaps it would have been more correct to have said, it was the history of the finding again of Rachel's lost children; of their coming again to their own border, and of the feelings of the mother's heart on again beholding herself surrounded with such a goodly company of sons and daughters. Surely from this we see that the words of Jeremiah are yet to be fulfilled, and that there will indeed be hope in the end, for the exiles and the wanderers of the house of Judah and of Israel.

The sons and daughters of the house of *Israel* may well be said to

Digitized by Google

be *lost*, for they are now "swallowed up among the nations;" but a day will come when they shall suddenly appear, a mighty host, so that Zion in wonder and amazement will exclaim, "Behold, I was left alone; these, where had they been!" Blessed Lord, hasten thou that day, when thine own faithful and true word shall come to pass!

Reviews.

The Apostles' School of Prophetic Interpretation, with its History down to the Present Time. By CHARLES MAITLAND, Author of "The Church in the Catacombs." London: Longman. 1849.

MR. MAITLAND is, in the main, a Futurist, only he holds fast the truth that the Apocalyptic Babylon is Rome. In his Introductory Essay, and occasionally elsewhere, he advances his positions somewhat too confidently,—almost superciliously, yet ably and tersely, and there is much in that Essay that is valuable. Differing from him in several things, and sometimes disposed to take offence at his sharp remarks on anti-futurists, yet we have read his volume with no common interest. It is a work of research, learning, and thought. He lays far too much stress upon primitive interpretation, and has quite failed to convince us, that what he calls the apostles' school of interpretation was really such; but he has given us a book containing much that is of real interest and value. The title of the work should be, "A History of Prophetical Interpretation," and as such it will be found of much use to the student of prophecy. Its peculiar excellence consists in its quotations and references, which are full and minute. We cannot say that we have gathered up much that is new in the actual interpretation of Scripture, but we feel that we owe much to it for information on the *history* of interpretation, from apostolic days down to the Reformation, a region little explored, and little likely to be explored, on account of the inaccessible and unreadable folios from which it requires to be gleaned.

At the same time, we should like Mr. Maitland to give his opponents credit for at least a little judgment. A supporter of the year-day system is not of necessity a fool; nor is Mr. S. R. Maitland entitled to one-half of the eulogy which the author bestows upon him, (p. 394—5). His acrimony, and uncourteous treatment of his opponents do not exhibit him in a very favourable light. Nor is he by any means so unassailable as is represented. It would have been well for the present Mr. Maitland, had he avoided, instead of following, the tone of his predecessor. Both write as if they were quite infallible, and as if those who differed with them were hardly worth their notice.

"The Praeterists (says Mr. C. M.) may be said to require no refu-

Digitized by Google

tation, since they condemn and expose each other," (p. 446). Just so we say of the Futurists; and if any one ask for proof, we put into his hands the present work, Mr. Burgh's, Mr. Newton's, and Mr. Kelly's. Will Mr. Maitland try to bring something like harmony out of these interpreters? And if he cannot, will he write more mildly and moderately in time to come?

The Spiritual Reign; an Essay on the Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. By Clemens. Second Edition, revised and enlarged. London: Hatchard. 1849.

Clemens, in the work before us, advocates the "spiritual reign," as the title of his book indicates. *We* also are advocates for the "spiritual reign;" so that Clemens, by implication at least, has wronged us at the outset. Does he think that we are contending for an *unspiritual* reign, or a *carnal* reign, or a *sinful* reign? Why assume the championship of a doctrine which no one is assailing? Why write as if he and his party had the exclusive, the pre-eminent distinction of being contenders for a spiritual reign, in opposition to men who were contending for the opposite? Is not this too like the Socinian method of warfare,—sending forth books with, perchance, such a title as "The Manhood of Christ," to prove that Christ is really a man, as if any Trinitarian thought of denying this.

We have never sought to rob the reign of Christ of any of its spirituality; nor are we acquainted with any millenarian work in which this is done. We add something to the spiritual, viz., the material, the visible, the palpable. But does this make the reign we contend for, an unspiritual or carnal reign? If so, then let us deny resurrection, for that is the adding of the material to the immaterial, the visible to the invisible. All that is spiritual in the reign of Christ we hold as firmly as our opponents, and we wonder why they should claim the exclusive honour of holding that the reign of Christ is spiritual?

Is Clemens a descendant of the old Gnostics? Does he hold that the addition of matter carnalizes a thing, or a person, or a kingdom. If he does not hold the intrinsic and essential sinfulness of matter, why should he affix a title to his volume, which implies that we, by contending for something outward as well as something inward, for something material as well as for something immaterial, are guilty of transmuting the reign of Christ into a carnal thing?

Clemens, while condemning our doctrine of the first resurrection, holds that the righteous are to rise *first*. He gives no positive text as the reason for this opinion; but from the manner in which he states it (p. 2), we suppose he founds it upon the expression in 1 Thess. iv. 16, —"The dead in Christ shall rise first." If so, he has singularly misapplied a passage which, according to all expositors, even on his own side, has nothing to do with the resurrection of the wicked at all; the word "first" does not refer to the priority of the resurrection of the righteous, but to the priority of the resurrection of the *dead* saints to the change of the *living* ones. Any anti-millenarian writer, how-

Digitized by Google

ever, will set him right on this point. If so, upon what foundation does he rest his statement, that the resurrection of the saints is to precede that of the ungodly?

Clemens admits grudgingly that millenarian doctrines prevailed in the early Church, and tries to account for their prevalence by a peculiar theory. He speaks of the "deep national prejudices of the first Jewish converts," and their cherished persuasion that the descendants of Abraham were ever to possess the almost exclusive glory of the Messiah's kingdom." (P. 3.)

Strange solution! The early Churches, *most of them Gentile*, held millenarian doctrine; and Clemens accounts for this by telling us of the deep national prejudices of the Jews, respecting their own national supremacy! "The rabbinical notion of a visibly reigning Messiah was congenial to them." How so, if they were Gentiles? What weight were they likely to attach to rabbinical authority? How could rabbinical notions be congenial to Gentile Christians? Our opponents seem ready to resort to any fancy or hypothesis which may cast doubts upon the unpleasant and unwelcome idea that the primitive Christians drew their millenarianism out of the Bible. Clemens must have been sore pressed when he was compelled to adopt the above hypothesis.

Then, in order to depreciate the early millenarians, Clemens tells us, that "they added to its other delights very luscious descriptions of the animal enjoyments of eating and drinking." (P. 3.)

This is just the old misrepresentation over again. When Clemens so readily discovers the *carnalities* of the old Chiliasts, why is he not equally zealous in exposing the *heresies* of their opponents? We deny the former, but he will not find it so easy to disprove the latter.

We find, however, that at present we must content ourselves with these few remarks. If possible, we shall return to the subject; our limits, rather than our will, forbid us saying more at present.

Thoughts on the Study of Prophecy. By A BARRISTER. London: J. J. Guillaume. 1849.

WE feel at a loss to know the precise object which the author of this book has in view; for, though well written and containing excellent things, it is a little vague. Still, it is well worth a perusal.

Maranatha: in connexion with the future History of the Jewish Nation. Dublin, 1839.

THIS book is ten years old, but only came lately into our hands. It contains almost all the extreme futurism subsequently developed in the works of Mr. Newton and Mr. Kelly.

It is written too confidently, and contains very many things which we cannot help calling rash and extravagant. Nor is the writer very accurate in the statements or facts. Thus we read,—"It is remarkable that even in the New Testament there is not a single *Gentile*

Digitized by Google

writer of Scripture." (P. 9.) Was Luke a Jew? Or did he not write the Acts of the Apostles and the Gospel that goes under his name? Again, in p. 75, Apollyon is spelt with a double *p;* and then we are told that the Greek figures which, as letters, would write the word Appollyon, will, if added together, not enumerated (What does this mean?), make exactly 666. No attempt is made to show this; as, indeed, how could there be, seeing any Greek scholar knows that it is impossible. The author is quite clear that the *third* kingdom is not the *Greek*, but the *Roman* Empire, and that the *fourth* is not yet come into existence! We ask for proof, but there is none given. We are told that all Jewish missionaries, with the exception of Joseph Wolf, tell the Jews that they are "to look for nothing more than a spiritual fulfilment of all the magnificent promises of their God." (P. 25.) It would have been well had the author inquired into the *facts* of the case before publishing such an unqualified condemnation of good men. We have reason to know that there are others besides Wolf who preach the literal fulfilment of the Word of God.

"The whole Jewish economy is to be restored." (P. 27.) Not so. Ezekiel describes a *new economy*, not the restoration of the old, as any reader of the last nine chapters of that Prophet may see.

Babylon is to be rebuilt, the Jews again carried captive into it, and again delivered! All confidently affirmed at p. 32, &c.

Satan's *first* sin was "his causing our first parents to sin!" (P. 35.) "It was because he had done this thing that the curse fell upon him!" (Ib.) Where the author procured this information we cannot discover.

Till "the Jews are again a nation," Satan "has nothing tangible to grapple with on the earth." (P. 37.) What does this mean?

The Jewish nation are the body of Moses, referred to in Zechariah and Jude. This may or may not be; but what becomes of the author's literality? Are we not told that "Babylon means Babylon, and neither Rome nor Popery;" and a saying of Luther quoted, that "when the Bible says a cow, it means a cow—when it says a man, it means a man?" (P. 11.) Why then is the body of Moses not to mean the body of Moses? And why are futurists to allow in themselves what they condemn in others? Especially when our author tells us that "no uninspired person is capable of interpreting any figurative prophecy." (P. 12.)

Our author believes in the literal "incarnation of the devil, in the vile person of Antichrist," (p. 39,) and cheers us with the thought that it is "no new doctrine," seeing "it is to be found in an old Irish manuscript." (P. 39.)

The mingling of the iron and the clay in the fourth Empire, is the mingling of devils and men. Just as angels and men before the flood held carnal intercourse, and so drew the flood upon the world, so shall it be again. "This mixture, abhorred of God, shall again overrun the earth, and so cause this kingdom to be diverse from all other kingdoms!" (P. 40.)

"No repentance, no return, no mercy to the apostates," *i.e.*, to

Digitized by Google

those belonging to the kingdom of Antichrist. "There will never be a single saint belonging to it." (P. 41.) Futurist writers frequently give the same representation. Yet what do they make of Revelation xi. 13—"the remnant were affrighted, and gave glory to the God of heaven."

The trumpets are all literal trumpets, and are literally and audibly to sound. (P. 46.) The horses are all literal horses, (pp. 88, 89,) and the author calls this "taking the true sayings of God in all their tremendous simplicity." (P. 46.) Yet the sword that proceeds out of the mouth of Christ is to be spiritualized! (P. 89.)

The Apocalyptic locusts are incarnate devils, "provided with bodies like locusts." (P. 59.) Nor are these devil-possessed locusts of a larger size than ordinary, as "the spirits within them are not subject to any law as to the precise portion of space they must occupy." (P. 62.)

As to the two witnesses, our author does not accord with futurists, for their tenet that these two persons are Moses and Elias, or Enoch and Elias, is set aside, and we are told that there is more "evidence for Daniel and John being appointed to this work." (P. 64.) Will our futurist brethren not be content to stop short, where inspiration has done so? The Holy Spirit has not mentioned the names of the witnesses, why will *they* persist in doing so?

"Antichrist is to be a Jew, not a Gentile, devil incarnate." It is "Jews, not Gentiles, that are called upon to come out of Babylon, not Rome." (P. 66.) We simply ask for proof. The author rejects the idea that by the seven hills, (Rev. xvii. 9,) there is a reference to the seven hills of Rome, or to any hills at all. Yet the Holy Spirit says expressly, "the seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth." But as the inspired interpretation interferes with our author's theory, we are told, that the "seven mountains are seven kingdoms." (P. 84.) What becomes of the author's literalism, and why are the true sayings of God not to be adhered to in all their "tremendous simplicity?"

Our author believes in the futurity of the seven churches of Asia,—along with Mr. Kelly,—thinking that "colonies of Jews may again be planted in these towns;" only this must be "previous to the appearing of Christ." As illustrative of the meaning of *Nicolaitanes* and their doctrines, (our author calls them *Nicolataines,*) we are referred, approvingly, to the answer once heard from "a pious Sunday-school teacher," that they were "the teaching and works of *Old Nick.*" (P. 55.)

We must say that we have read this volume with much sorrow. May it be a warning to our futurist brethren!

The Jew; Past, Present, and Future. By MARIANNE PARROTT. London: Wertheim and Macintosh.

THE object of this little work is to explain to those who have not much time for reading, or have not had much opportunity of hearing, on the

Digitized by Google

subject of the Jews, what the Scriptures represent regarding their state and expectations. It is written for cottages and the like. The information is conveyed in the form of conversations, in a style suited to the object in view, and is closely scriptural; tender love to Israel breaking through all its pages.

God's Answer to England's Fast. A Sermon, &c. By the Rev. JAMES KELLY. London: 1847.

God's Altar for the Acceptance of England's Thanksgiving. Ditto. Ditto.

THOUGH these refer to former years of fasting and of thanksgiving, yet we may notice them briefly here, as well suited for circulation in these days of increasing judgment and continued indifference on the part of the nation to these judgments. Why will Britain not fall upon her knees before the Lord? Is she given over to strong delusion, or to hardness of heart? Let the ministers of Christ lay the matter to heart, and call upon their people to consider the solemn position in which they are now placed. Nothing can save the nation now but the believing, earnest cry of those who know the Lord, and can intercede with him in behalf of a guilty land.*

Christian Loyalty. A Sermon, preached on the Lord's-day after Her Majesty's Visit to the City of Glasgow. By the Rev. J. G. LORIMER, D.D. Glasgow: W. R. McPhun. 1849.

THOUGH there is nothing here directly giving forth the author's prophetical views, and though the indirect glimpses that we have of them are not entirely in harmony with our own, yet we need not on these accounts hesitate to say that this Sermon is well thought and well written; that it contains much truth on a very vital topic, and that it turns to excellent account the recent visit of Her Majesty to the Scottish capital of commerce. We assent very heartily to the author's prayer: "May we never forget as a nation; may the illustrious family now seated on the throne, never forget that the true greatness of Britain at home, intellectually, commercially, socially, and her real power abroad among the kingdoms of the Continent, have ever been identified with her homage to the principles of Protestant and Evangelical Christianity." †

* SIGN OF THE TIMES.—The Popish Master of the Mint has effected a singular and ominous alteration in the coinage of Great Britain. It is fitted to startle every one who loves to see a nation or a government recognising, even upon their coins, the supremacy of the King of kings. We can excuse the omission of "Defender of the faith," as it is in all likelihood a mere Popish fling at Henry the Eighth; but we condemn the infidelity that struck out "*Dei Gratia.*" However trivial the matter may seem to some, it is a very decided indication of the Popish infidelity, or infidel-Popery, or pure Atheism which is leavening the land, and ripening us for the last Antichrist.

† The respected publisher of the above Sermon has transmitted to us a specimen of his "New Polyglott Bible." Taking both cheapness and neatness into consideration, it is one of the most remarkable editions of the Scriptures issued in modern times.

Digitized by Google

Foot-prints of the Creator; or, the Asterolepis of Stromness. By HUGH MILLAR. London: Johnstone and Hunter. 1849.

WERE this simply a geological work, we should have found no room for a notice of it in our pages,—able, scientific, eloquent, as it is throughout. But it contains more than geology. It is a thorough and masterly demolition of that flippant semi-Atheism which exhibited itself a few years ago in the noted work, "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation," which has spread itself among half-educated, half-scientific, irreligious men, and which is one of the saddest symptoms of that crisis in the world's history at which we have arrived, or to which, at least, we are swiftly approaching. The following extract will show that in some parts the work touches upon our more peculiar province:—

"I know not where we shall find grounds for the belief that the Sabbath-day during which God rested, was merely commensurate in its duration with one of the Sabbaths of short-lived man, a brief period, measured by a single revolution of the earth upon its axis. We have not, as has been shewn, a shadow of evidence that He resumed His work of Creation on the morrow; the geologist finds no trace of post-Adamic creation—the theologian can tell us of none. God's Sabbath of rest may still exist; *the work of* REDEMPTION *may be the work of his Sabbath-day.** The elevatory process, through successive acts of Creation, which engaged him during myriads of ages, was of an ordinary week-day character; but when the term of his moral government began, the elevatory process proper to it assumed the divine character of the Sabbath. . . . . The expectation of any very great advance in the present scene of things—great at least when measured by man's large capacity of conceiving of the good and fair—seems to be like all human hope when restricted to time, an expectation doomed to disappointment. . . . . And so, faith, undeceived by the mirage of the midway desert, whatever form or name, political or religious, the phantasmagoria may bear, must continue to look beyond its unsolid and tremulous glitter—its bare rocks exaggerated by the vapour into air-drawn castles, and its stunted bushes magnified into goodly trees, and fixing her gaze upon the re-creation still future, the terminal dynasty yet unbegun, she must be content to enter upon her final rest, for she will not enter upon it earlier:—

> . . . At return
> Of Him . . . .
> The woman's seed. . . . .
> Last in the clouds from heaven to be revealed
> In glory of the Father, to dissolve
> Satan with his perverted world; then raise
> From the conflagrant mass, purged and refined,
> New heavens, new earth, ages of endless date."

—Pages 307, 312.

* We are rather inclined to put this suggestion in another form. God's Sabbath was intended to begin upon the seventh day spoken of in Genesis, and to have continued, we know not how long. Man's sin marred this Sabbath, and God was forced (we speak after the manner of men) to begin his work anew,—his *new-creation* work. This new-creation work is still going on; and it is to this that the Lord refers, when he says, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," (John v. 17,) *i.e.*, our Sabbath is not yet begun, and therefore I cannot be charged with breaking the Sabbath, in doing this miracle. When it is accomplished, then the interrupted Sabbath shall recommence—just at the very point where it was broken in upon, only on a higher scale—with Eden restored—Satan expelled—all things made new—the Second Adam, and the true Eve, his bride the Church, having dominion over all things—and God resting from his work, and rejoicing in his Sabbath; the σαββατισμος which the apostle speaks of as remaining for the people of God.—EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

Correspondence.

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

SIR,—Though various observations affecting myself have met my eye in your "Journal," that might naturally have called forth from me remark or reply, I have hitherto abstained from offering any. I have abstained chiefly on two accounts: first, from wishing, before communicating with you, to make acquaintance with the prophetic views and general character of the "Journal," —its character in respect both of intelligence and fairness; secondly, from the press of constant occupation, and unwillingness to do anything that might possibly lead to a controversy in your periodical, for the which I have little time, and still less inclination. Besides that, I knew you were likely to be oversupplied, rather than undersupplied, for a while at least, with matter; so that it seemed to me it might be kinder to the Editor rather to be silent for the present, than to help to overwhelm him with communications. In your last Number, however, there is a remark affecting my Apocalyptic work, on a point so important, that I feel it due to the cause of truth not to defer noticing it.

The remark occurs in your brief Review of Mr. Hislop's little book, entitled, "The Red Republic." "On the *main* point of his exposition," you observe, "he holds his ground successfully against Elliott, and the author of 'The Seventh Vial;' proving, we think, to demonstration, that the *Beast from the sea*, and the *Beast from the abyss*, are not one and the same." You then go on to say: "It may be true, as his opponents contend, that the *sea* and the *abyss* are interchangeable expressions in classical authorship: but it is just as true that they are not interchangeable in Apocalyptic imagery." And you finally thus conclude: "If, then, the Dragon is the Roman empire in its Paganism, and the Beast of the sea is the Roman empire in its Papal form, the Beast from the abyss must be the same empire in some yet undeveloped character."*

Thus, according to the Reviewer, one grand point on which my view of the identity of the two Apocalyptic Beasts is founded, and on which Mr. Hislop has overthrown it, is the assumption (the erroneous assumption) that in the Apocalypse the word *abyss* is to be taken in the sense of *sea*, not *hell*. Now let your readers turn to my chapter on the identity of the two Beasts in the Horæ; and they will there find me writing on the question thus: "But is this (viz., the origin of the *one* Beast from the *sea*, of the *other* from the *abyss*) a *real* discrepancy: even allowing, *as I am quite ready to do*, that the word *abyss* means the *abyss of hell?*† A note subjoined is as follows: "See on the word *abyss*, my Vol. i. p. 414." At which place of reference, respecting the locusts that came out of the smoke from the pit of the abyss, I not only argue for the sense of *hell*, in preference to that of *sea*, but, moreover, I urge specially, in support of the former sense, those selfsame two passages of Luke viii. 31, and Apocalypse xx. 3,‡ which Mr. Hislop, whether borrowing from me, or altogether independently, has also urged, to the same effect, at pp. 108, 109 of his book.§ But, while thus fully making this admission, I then proceed to contend that the two diverse characteristics of origin from the *sea*,

* See the "Journal" for July, p. 436.

† Vol. iii. p. 69. I cite from the Third Edition. The argument is just the same in the two former editions.

‡ The one passage about the legion of devils praying not to be sent into the abyss, the other about Satan's being cast into the abyss, and sealed up there, preparatory to the Millennium.

§ You yourself also (though unconsciously) here follow me. "The locusts come out of the abyss: do they rise from the sea? Satan is shut up in the abyss: is he shut up in the sea?"

and origin from the *abyss*, do not imply any real difference and distinction between the Beasts, of which the one and the other are predicated. Quite the contrary; because that the rising of the one Beast out of *the abyss* can only mean its having a devilish or Satanic origination; and that this devilish or Satanic origination is expressly ascribed in the Apocalypse to the *Beast from the sea.* "The dragon," or devil, it is said, "was wroth with the woman; and went to make war with the remnant of her seed which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony (or *witness*) of Jesus;" and that then (in order evidently to carry out this purpose) he evoked the *Beast from the sea;* and "gave it his power, and seat, and great authority."* I add, further, that, even as regards the *figure* itself, there is no inconsistency whatsoever in depicting the one and same Beast, as having its origin alike from the sea and from the lower depth of hell beneath the sea, seeing that volcanic agency operates constantly in nature beneath it, and that thus it is no uncommon phenomenon for an island of deep volcanic origin to rise suddenly from, and out of, the sea.†

Such, Sir, are my views on this point, as expressed in the "Horæ." You will now see your total misrepresentation of them. I must do Mr. Hislop the justice to say that he does not misrepresent me, as you do, about the Apocalyptic sense of the *abyss.*‡ What he is chargeable with, in common with yourself, is the passing over in total silence of my argument in favour of the identity of the two Beasts, drawn from the very fact of the declared *hellish*, or *devilish*, origin of the *Beast from the abyss;* a devilish origin being similarly ascribed, most expressly, to the *Beast from the sea.*

And considering the extremely important bearing on all Apocalyptic interpretation of the question, as to the identity or diversity of the Beast from the sea and Beast from the abyss, and also that there is in the "Horæ" a long and elaborate series of arguments to prove their identity, I must beg to consider it as a matter of grave charge against both Mr. Hislop and yourself, that, while professing to have completely overthrown my view, and established the opposite one, you should have passed over the most and chief of them in total silence. I will here state but two of these arguments, in addition to the one already given: the first, an argument altogether independent of any system of Apocalyptic interpretation; the second one, addressing itself to such as believe, in common with yourself, myself, and Mr. Hislop, that the year-day system is true, and that the Beast from the sea symbolizes the Roman Papal Empire. The first is this, that in Apocalypse xix. 20, the Beast in his *last* form, and consequently the *Beast from the abyss*, is, just before his destruction, described as in association with "the False Prophet that wrought miracles before him:" a description which positively identifies the Beast in his last form, or Beast from the abyss, with the Beast from the sea of Apocalypse xiii.: and the miracle-working False Prophet of Apocalypse xix., associated with the *latter*, with the two-horned lamb-like Beast, that wrought miracles before the *former*.§ The second argument is drawn from what is said of the two last *heads*

* Apoc. xii. 17; xiii. 2. I must beg your readers, while on the subject of this paper, to mark very particularly the declaration here made about the dragon's great purpose, when about to evoke the Beast from the sea, and (invest it, as his own substitute, with his seat and power and great authority, viz., that of making war with them that *kept up the witness for Jesus.* Against whom, consequently, under the name of ἅγιοι, or saints, the Beast from the sea is spoken of presently after (xiii. 7) as making war, and as conquering them. Is not the analogy between the Beast from the sea, under the devil's direction, thus warring against and conquering witnesses for Jesus, and the Beast from the abyss warring against and conquering and killing the two symbolic or representative witnesses for Jesus, such, and so complete, as to furnish in itself a corroborative proof both of the identity of the *Beasts* in the one case, and the identity too of the *witnesses* conquered in the one case and the other.

† Apoc. iii. 69, Note 3. In this note I illustrate from a late exemplification of the fact in the Mediterranean. A little while since I met with the account of another exemplification of similar character that occurred in the Ægean about the year 726, during the reign of the Emperor Leo. It is related in Fleury's "Ecclesiastical History," B. xlii. ch. 1.

‡ He only says, "*Not a few commentators* have confounded the Beast from the bottomless pit," &c., without mentioning one.

§ See Apoc. xiii. 12.

Digitized by Google

of the Beast, viz., that the *Beast from the abyss* is the Beast under its eighth or last head; and that the seventh head, or last head but one, when he should come, was to continue but for a little time.* Now, both Mr. Hislop and yourself agree with me in regarding the Beast's last form but one, or Beast under his last head but one, *i.e.*, the *Beast from the sea*, as the Roman Papal Empire, the duration of which Papal Empire in its power was predicted to be 1260 days, or years, a prediction since fulfilled in history;† which being 10, and as the *little* time it (the seventh head) was to last is evidently a term of time to be construed comparatively with the duration (the *longer* duration) of the sixth and eighth heads preceding and following it; therefore, not to speak of the sixth head, the eighth head, or Beast from the abyss, on your and Mr. Hislop's hypothesis, ought to last a length of time, so great as that the 1260 years of the Roman Popedom should be but small in the comparison. But, behold, it is but till 1866, or perhaps thirty years beyond it, that Mr. H., and, I suppose, yourself too, will have this Beast—the Red Republic—to continue in existence, *i.e.*, at the most, not above forty-six or forty-eight years.‡ Now, amidst the many wonderful discoveries of the present age, I am not yet aware of any one having been made in arithmetic by which forty-eight may be accounted long and 1260 short.

Yet a word or two more, ere I conclude, respecting Mr. Hislop and his book. At p. 248 he is pleased to charge me with "a stupendous mistake" in regard of the Apocalyptic temple scenery. "Says Mr. Elliott, 'The great brazen altar of sacrifice was in the open court, next the sanctuary; that court, therefore, was necessarily and expressly included [*sc.*, in the measurement, Apoc. xi. 1].' Here there is certainly a stupendous mistake. . . . . . Does not Mr. E. perceive that his argument proceeds on the Romish supposition, that there is *still* an altar of burnt-offering under the Gospel? . . . . Under the Christian dispensation there is only one [altar], the *altar of incense*. . . . . Throughout the whole of the Apocalypse, wherever an altar is mentioned, *it* is '*the* altar,' implying that there is one, and one only. Now where stood the altar of incense? In the sanctuary, or holy place." And Mr. H. is pleased further to state the *motive* which impelled me to this stupendous mistake. "His (Mr. E.'s) *object* in thus enlarging the spiritual temple is obviously to get within its limits the unwieldy hierarchy of the Church of England, with all its corruptions." Now let us turn from Mr. Hislop's dogmas and accusations on this point to the New Testament. *The* altar (το θυσιαστηριον, with the article) is spoken of in its *literal* sense *ten* times, if I mistake not, in the *other* New Testament books,—viz., Matt. v. 23, 24; xxiii. 18, 19, 20, 35; Luke xi. 51; 1 Cor. ix. 13, x. 18; Heb. vii. 13: and *in every one* in the sense of the great brazen altar of burnt-offering in the temple-court.§ Once, too, the word is used without the definite article, viz., Heb. xiii. 10,—"We have *an* altar, whereof they have no right to eat that serve the tabernacle." Its sense is here,

* Apoc. xvii. 10, 11.

† Mr. H., p. 60, dates the rise of the Popedom from Phocas' Decree, A.D. 604.

‡ Mr. Hislop, p. 228, thinks it "not improbable that the thirty supplementary years, which in Daniel are added to the 1260, may be filled up with the last judgments on the Antichristian nations." I, therefore, give Mr. H.'s Red Republic the advantage of this additional term of existence. Among your points of difference with Mr. H. you do not specify this as one.

My own argument on these two points will be found at pp. 65, 68 of my vol. iii. of the "Horæ." The former I have more fully urged, if I rightly recollect, in my reply to our common friend, the Rev. W. G. Barker, of the Futurist School. It is in my own judgment completely decisive on the point in question.

§ Its sense is determined to be this in most of the passages referred to either by the mention of the worshipper's offerings brought to it, or of the priest's supply of food from it. In Heb. vii. 13, both the superior prominency of the priestly services at the great brazen altar, and also the apostle's drawing out the distinction as one of *tribes*, not of *families*, combine to make it little doubtful that the great altar is meant. And so, I believe, expositors will be found generally to interpret it. In Matt. xxiii. 35, it is, I think, most generally supposed by critics that the word Barachiah is a mistake of the copyists, and that Zacharias, the son of Jehoiada, is meant, whose death is related in 2 Chron. xxiv. 21: "And they stoned him with stones.... in the *court* of the house of the Lord." So Grotius, Le Clerc, Whitby. In any case, as the death of the person martyred was "between the temple (or sanctuary) and the altar," it determines the altar to be that in the altar-court.

Digitized by Google

figurative in application to the *Christian* system; but still, though Mr. H. may accuse St. Paul of Romish superstition for using such a figure in allusion to the same great altar of sacrifice,* it is but once that the *altar of incense* is intended, viz., in Luke i. 11; and then it is expressly so defined, "the altar of incense." Then as to the *Apocalyptic* use of the term. The two first examples of its use are quite sufficient to show that the general New Testament use of it is here, too, followed. The first is in the fifth seal: there we read of the souls of martyrs under *the altar*. And with what allusion, and to what altar? Evidently with allusion to victims offered to God on the great altar in the Jewish altar-court, and their blood, which was their life, poured out at its foot.† What had such a figure to do with *the altar of incense?* Secondly, after the opening of the seventh seal (Apoc. viii. 3), we read that the angel-priest stood by *the* altar, and had much incense given him, that he might offer this with the prayers of all saints (not on *it*, the altar first mentioned, but) on "*the golden altar that is before the throne*." The very phraseology and change of expression might suffice to show that two different altars are here intended; the one, of course, the great altar of sacrifice in the court; the other, the smaller golden altar of incense within the sanctuary. Quite confirmatory of which view is the recorded mode of the priest's proceeding, under the Levitical law, in the rite of offering incense. We read thus in Lev. xvi. 12: "And he (the priest) shall take a censer of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense, and bring it within the vail: and he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord." From which of the two temple-altars was it that he was to take the burning coals of fire? Assuredly from the great brazen altar of sacrifice in the temple-court, for it was on that alone that the fire was kept ever burning.‡ As regards the golden altar, it was the censer containing coals of fire and incense that was put on *it*, not coals themselves. The best expositors will be found to describe the mode of incense-offering under the Levitical law as I describe it, and that the coals of fire were to be taken from the brazen altar in the altar-court.§ In fact, there was a meaning of deepest interest attached to this particular in the ritual. The embers of the fire on the great altar, mixed up as they were with the ashes of the burnt-offerings, symbolized Christ's expiatory sacrifice; the application of which, and which alone, could make any incense-offering of prayer or praise acceptable to God. Hence, the strictness of the old law concerning it, that no other or strange fire should be used in the incense-offering; and hence, too, the fearful punishment on Nadab and Abihu when they violated the law, and applied other fire to the incense.‖

And now let me ask, Whose is "the stupendous mistake" on this point, Mr. Hislop's or mine? Is it the case that I *Romanize* ¶ in uniting the two altars

* For, as before said, it was from *it* alone that the priests partook.

† Compare Levit. iv. 7, 18, 25; xvii. 11. St. Paul alludes to the same altar somewhat differently in Philip. ii. 17, and 2 Tim. iv. 6, his allusion being to the libations poured on the sacrifices. See Exodus xxix. 40, 41.

‡ See Levit. vi. 13.

§ *E.g.*, Bishop Patrick on Levit. xvi. 12,—"He shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from the altar before the Lord," explains it as,—"from the brazen altar, where the bullock was slain; for coals were burning before God nowhere else but there." And Horne (Introd. P. iii. ch. i. § 1): "The fire that was on this altar of burnt-offerings, was at first miraculously kindled by God. God had beforehand ordered that the fire on this altar, when once kindled, should never go out. It was reckoned an impious presumption to make use of any other but this sacred fire in burning incense before the Lord."

‖ Levit. x. 1.

¶ Mr. Hislop, in charging me with *Romanizing* on the matter, makes the strange mistake of confounding things in their *literal* sense, with things in their *figurative*. Under the Gospel, we have no altar in the *literal* sense or for *literal* expiatory offerings, such as the Romish Church asserts. But in the *figurative* sense we cannot do without an altar,—as it symbolizes Christ's self-immolated offering: and so the very centre round which all true Church worship gathers, and with which it is all associated. "We *have* an altar," says St. Paul (Heb. xiii. 10), *i. e.*, in this figurative sense. Mr. Hislop also forgets, that the altar was not one on which expiatory burnt-offerings were alone offered, but also freewill offerings and peace-offerings; the latter, however, always in association (through the very altar on which they were offered) with the expiatory burnt-offering.

Digitized by Google

in the Apocalyptic temple-scene?—or that Mr. H., however unintentionally, violates the whole tenor and spirit of Divine revelation on the matter, in wishing to separate those two altars which God has joined together, and which, therefore, no man may put asunder? I have now drawn out the evidence about it pretty much at large, both because of the very great importance of the point in Apocalyptic interpretation, and also because I have had reason to know that the same strange mistake concerning it has been made by others besides him.

In conclusion, Rev. Sir, permit me to ask, what think you must be a candid and reasonable man's opinion of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy,"—its intelligence and its fairness,—when such ill-considered Apocalyptic speculations, and such unwarranted attacks on an author who has written somewhat elaborately on the subject, are thus endorsed and lauded by its Editor? Nor, indeed, attacks on me only, but also on the Church of England.* Even were its title, "The Scotch Free Church Journal of Prophecy," which it is not, one might surely have expected, that on such a subject the Tweed, and all ecclesiastical distinctions associated with it, would be forgotten; and truth in every case carefully sought, and misrepresentation, come from what quarter it might, rigidly discountenanced.† Your first Number seemed drawn up in somewhat of such a spirit as this. I cannot say the same of much that has met my eye in the numbers which have followed.

I write with no unkindly feeling; and am, Sir,

Yours faithfully,
E. B. Elliott.

P.S. As I send this above a month before the time of your next publication, and it is a paper in reply, I take for granted that you will make a point to insert it in that next Number of the Journal, accordantly with the general rule followed in such periodicals.

[The brief article which has called forth the above letter will be found in our July Number, at pages 435 and 436. There is very little said either in favour of Mr. Hislop's book, or against Mr. Elliott,—just as little as can be

* I do not mean, that the Editor endorses or applauds the attacks on the Church of England, but that such attacks are in the books applauded by him.

† Let me take the opportunity of mentioning two or three such misrepresentations of myself. 1. I observe in your brief notice of Mr. Rabett's book, in the same July Number, the following:—"He complains, *and with justice*, that Mr. Elliott, after selecting the name *Lateinos*, should have again *thrown the question into uncertainty*, by proposing the alternative solution of ἡ λατινη βασιλεια." *This* I do not consider a fair representation of the matter. I begin my argument on it with the strong statement, "Nor *can I conceive any name more appropriate, and in every point satisfactory*, than the famous name λατεινος, the Latin meaning. I then develop the evidence, and answer objections *through seven pages;* then *in a single sentence* refer to a note subjoined, containing various other solutions, and "call attention very specially to Mr. Clarke's, of ἡ λατινη βασιλεια, which is indeed so remarkable, that I cannot but think that the Divine Spirit had it also in view, as an alternative solution involving the word *Latin* in its more usual, though not the mystic, orthography." Then I add, "But *the principal*, and *that which most clearly and simply answers to every requirement* of the sacred enigma, I *fully believe* to be Irenæus' solution, λατεινος." Does this "*throw the matter into uncertainty*," in so far as the expression of my opinion is concerned? Mr. Rabett is angry at my seeming to slight his book, by saying I had not seen it; and that I inferred from a notice I had seen of it, that it would not add materially to the evidence. Hence his mode of writing. But the Editor of the "Journal of Prophecy" might have been expected not to select and adopt the representations of an angry man. 2. In a late English work on prophecy, I am stated to have explained "the lion roaring" of Apocalypse x., to mean *Pope Leo's* voice; whereas it is elaborately explained by me of *Christ speaking through Luther to the Reformers*. This is a misrepresentation on a par even with those by Dr. Keith; which latter, let me beg to say, I think the Editor of the "Journal of Prophecy," when he had their refutation in hand, might have been expected to notice long ere this, in terms of regret and reprobation. What if the Rev. Horace Bonar were to find himself charged in some book on prophecy, with saying things the most contrary to what he has really said, with admixtures of burlesque, &c., to make the thing piquant? Would he think that no duty devolved on an Editor of a Prophetic Journal, in consequence, when the facts were brought under his eye? 3. Even warm and kind friends have sometimes represented my opinions and statements inaccurately. I have observed various such inaccuracies in Dr. Cumming's book. One is, that I have noted the current year 1849, as the year destined for the downfall of the Turkish empire. Such is not the case. I have only mentioned it as the opinion of certain others. It was not, and is not, my own.

Digitized by Google

well conceived fitted to awaken aught approaching to unpleasant feeling. Yet the close of Mr. Elliott's letter betrays a sensitiveness respecting this, which we are quite at a loss to understand. The latter part of his last note also surprises us. In fairness to ourselves, we add a few remarks.

1. The opinion of many a "candid and reasonable man" has been given of our Journal, and it has not been thought so deficient in intelligence and fairness, as the above sentence would imply; nor has it before been charged with indulging in "unwarrantable attacks." Even granting that it had mistaken Mr. Elliott's meaning, this was not broad enough ground whereon to rest the charge of "misrepresentation." The friend who wrote the above review is not awanting either in "intelligence or fairness," and is quite able to give a reason for his statements.

2. Though it may be true that Mr. Elliott has "written elaborately" on the Apocalypse, it does not follow that we should agree with him in his views; still less does it follow, that, when we calmly state our dissent from him, and our agreement with another, on a special point, we should be censured in a spirit such as the above. We claim the liberty of stating our views freely, whether in the way of praise or censure, of accordance or dissent. Why Mr. Elliott should speak of "attacks on me," we know not. Let the reader examine for himself the above sentence of our review, and say, whether it contains the very shadow of an attack on Mr. Elliott. Why magnify one brief expression of dissent from his opinions, into "attacks,"—nay, "unwarranted attacks" upon him? We have said that Mr. Hislop "holds his ground successfully against Elliott, and the author of 'The Seventh Vial,' proving, we think, to demonstration, that the Beast from the sea, and the Beast from the abyss, are not one and the same." Is this an attack? Could difference of opinion be expressed more courteously?

3. The charge of attacking the Church of England is, perhaps, the most unjust and groundless of all. This is qualified in a note, by the statement that such attacks "are in the books applauded" by us. This is unfair. Do we approve of everything in a book, because we accord *generally* with the author's scheme? Or are we not to praise a book at all, because it contains something worthy of dispraise? Or must we single out *every* fault in every book that we review? Mr. Elliott has praised the work entitled, "The Seventh Vial;" does he thereby endorse the democratic leanings of the author? Mr. Elliott has said far more in praise of that writer, than we said in favour of Mr. Hislop. We merely described Mr. Hislop's volume, as an "unpretending work;" and, after saying, that on some points we differed from him, we remarked, that he had "thought much, and reasoned soundly upon his subject, which is the prophesying and death of the witnesses;" adding, that "he held his ground successfully against Elliott, and the author of 'The Seventh Vial;'" yet this small amount of praise (too small we should say), thus very generally expressed, is supposed enough to bring us in guilty of attacks upon the Church of England! Not one word has come from our pen, which might by the utmost stretch of interpretation be construed into an expression of disrespect towards that Church, or any Church; yet, because Mr. H. has spoken disparagingly of that Church, and we have called his work an "unpretending" volume (though expressing difference on some points), we are accused of "unwarranted attacks" upon the Church of England. "Permit us to ask, Reverend Sir (we use Mr. Elliott's words), what think you must be a candid and reasonable man's opinion of such a charge?" Or does Mr. Elliott deem it consistent either with the charity or the courtesy of Christian brotherhood, thus to accuse us without the remotest vestige of a proof? If we are guilty of these "unwarranted attacks" upon the Church of England, how is it that our most cordial supporters,—both contributors and subscribers,—are ministers and members of that Church? How is it that by far the greater number of books that we praise and agree with, are written by ministers of that Church? If Mr. Elliott would point out *one* of these "unwarranted

attacks," either upon himself or on the Church of England, we promise to furnish him with the fullest retractation that he can desire. He was surely writing in the language of exaggeration (to use no stronger word), when he thus spoke of "unwarranted attacks."

4. We do not quite understand the drift of the remark, as to the "Scotch Free Church Journal of Prophecy," and we are not willing to put an interpretation upon it inconsistent with right and honourable feeling. Knowing the delicate position which the present Editor occupies in reference to other Churches, Mr. Elliott might have spared the imputation implied in the above allusion. We know something of editorial honour, as well as Christian feeling: and this would have been enough to forbid our giving utterance to our own ecclesiastical preferences and principles. We can appeal to our readers, if we have ever given any indication of the remotest wish to sectarianise this Journal. The only prophetical work in which the Scotch Free Church is lauded (Mr. Beith's), is one from whose interpretations we totally dissent. And as to the remark about ecclesiastical distinctions being forgotten in works on prophecy, we can only say, that we have never, on any occasion, directly or indirectly, introduced such distinctions. Has Mr. Elliott kept his own rule in mind? Is his own work upon the Apocalypse free from such attacks upon Churches?

5. It is not the part of a Christian brother to charge another with "misrepresentations," and to insinuate that "truth in every case" is not "carefully sought" by us. Our fault, taken at its worst, has been a *mistake*, though even this we have not yet discovered. We can say as men who fear God, that we *have* sought truth most carefully in every case that has come before us. Our non-agreement with Mr. Elliott is surely no proof either of misrepresentation, or of want of the love of truth.

6. Mr. Elliott is displeased with our not taking up the controversy between him and Dr. Keith, and noticing the latter "in terms of regret and reprobation." We are not now going to give our reasons for silence in this matter, but this we must say, since Mr. Elliott compels us, that, whatever be the "terms of regret and reprobation" we might use, we should have to divide it between the combatants. Granting that Dr. Keith is as faulty as Mr. Elliott thinks him, it was a noble opportunity for a Christian to show himself a Christian, by returning good for evil. Mr. Elliott has not done so.

7. In our first Number, we had occasion to refer to Mr. Elliott with commendation. In our succeeding numbers we have hardly referred to him at all, and then to differ from him. In these circumstances, it would have looked better had he not spoken so approvingly of the first, and so disparagingly of the others. One is apt unconsciously to be biassed in such a case, and is not a fair witness. The testimony of brethren does not agree with Mr. Elliott's.

Such are our remarks on Mr. Elliott's "unwarranted attacks" upon us. They have been wrung from us in self-defence, and under a sense of what was due to ourselves, and to our readers. To say thus much, has been painful enough; to say less, would have been unmanly and unchristian.]

IS THE APOCALYPSE FULFILLED, OR UNFULFILLED?—No. IV.

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

DEAR SIR,—Believing it will be acceptable to your readers, as it is convenient to myself, that the remaining points at issue between me and the writer of Article No. V. in your first Number should be disposed of in one unbroken communication, I shall endeavour to make my present letter a full and final one on the subject. It may be well, then, in the first place, to recapitulate the points which it has been my object calmly to discuss. They have been as follow:—

Digitized by Google

1. The design of prophecy. In opposition to my Reviewer, I have urged on this head, that prophecy, as given to the Church, is for their comfort and warning, *prior to fulfilment;* and therefore, in so far as its import has not been anticipated in any age, it has not been useful as simple prophecy. The bearing of this on the popular system of Apocalyptic interpretation, represented by Mr. Elliott, is obvious. According to it, the greater part of the Apocalypse is, and has been, useful *only as history;* for each generation of the Church to whom it was future, it is conceded, understood it not, nor were they at all guided by its announcements. On the contrary, they misconceived its meaning, and looked for far different events than it presented to them. Yea, even while its contents were being fulfilled before their eyes, they were unconscious of the fact—not to speak of the centuries afterwards—during which their successors continued equally unbenefited by it, *as converted into history!* These are startling corollaries to the popular principles of interpretation. But, as I have ventured to maintain, if the Apocalypse be still unfulfilled, whatever darkness in reference to it has characterized the Church in past times, or characterizes it still, room is yet afforded for its vindication as prophecy. It may at length,—we know not how soon,—prove the beacon to his Church that God designed it to be—the light "shining in a dark place till the day dawn."

2. I have insisted on it that in regard to the Apocalypse, *mere hypothesis* is no right starting-point of interpretation; and I have shewn, from Mr. Elliott's own admission, that he thus objectionably commenced his elaborate work; not as his friend would suggest, employing hypothesis in the tentative way in which, companying with experiment, it is legitimate, but adopting the shallow traditions that originated in, and now rest upon, inadequate acquaintance with the word of God.

3. I have urged, from the analogy of prophecy in the *Old* Testament, what might be expected to be its scope in the *New;* and that, as in the former, it has confessedly passed over the events, however important in our eyes, which constitute the history of Christendom; so in the latter; that Israel, with their earthly calling as a nation, is in both spheres of Revelation the centre of the Divine dealings with the world at large; and that, until their redemption approaches, the harp of prophecy is silent, touching all Gentile affairs.

Kindred with this fact, I have remarked, is the peculiar character of this dispensation, as the Divine parenthesis in God's transactions with the Jews, wherein he is occupied with the development of the exceeding riches of his grace, in the exaltation to special glory of his elect Church. Hence it is called "the mystery hidden in God from the foundation of the world," and it was accordingly reserved from the testimony of the prophets of old.

I now take up the subject at this point. My Reviewer condemns the position I have thus advanced, in a very summary way. He denies our dispensation to be a parenthesis, except "*in a certain limited sense, and with reference to the purely Jewish promises.*" This very language, however, implies what I contend for; for if the present be a time of dormancy touching the blessings pronounced in the prophetic word to the *Jews*, it must be equally so, touching those referred to as the *Gentiles'* portion, *inasmuch as the latter are ever made dependant on the former.* That this is the mode of prophetic revelation in the Old Testament cannot be doubted by any who examine its prophecies in detail. They all speak after the manner of the Sixty-seventh Psalm, or (to take a New Testament example,) the Eleventh of Romans, where the world's revival, as it were, is celebrated as the result of Israel's reconciliation. Here indeed the question arises, is there no exception to this? Have we not prophecies in the Old Testament distinctly referring to the calling and blessing of the present Church—Gentile, as it is, for the most part? To this inquiry, as having an important bearing on the matter in hand, I addressed myself, in my pamphlet,* showing that what were generally conceived to be special predic-

* "Apocalyptic Interpretation," &c. Nisbet and Co.

tions of our dispensation, were not so, but looked onward, in accordance with the general tenor of prophecy, to that period of Gentile blessedness which is yet future. First, however, disposing of an apparently preliminary objection, I set myself to show that 1 Peter i. 11, as summing up the character of Old Testament prophecy, conflicted not with my position. My words were as follow: "These sufferings and *glories*" (for in the original the word is plural) "are not to be limited to Messiah's personally; Israel's, His mystical members, are also included; though even of theirs He is to be regarded, so to speak, as the great *sensorium*. And that the passage has this enlarged signification would appear, were the translation literally given; for it runs thus: "Who testified beforehand, *unto Christ*, the sufferings, and after these the glories."

Here, I should say, my Reviewer's translation serves my purpose as well—"*The sufferings that pertained to Christ;*" and I thankfully stand corrected by his remark, that in my rendering I gave not the force of the Greek article. The fact is, I feared I might be un-English if I did so, for thus the sentence would strictly be—*the Christ-ward sufferings;* and what I desired to press upon my readers' attention was simply, that the sufferings alluded to included what belonged to Messiah, *relatively* as well as personally. And of this there can be no doubt, for where only the *personal* sufferings of our Lord are contemplated, the expression is different. (See 2 Cor. i. 5.)

Proceeding then with my exposition of the passage, I thus observed: "Amidst the glowing rehearsals of Israel's ultimate blessedness, and that of the *nations*, which characterize the Old Testament prophets, the present temporary eclipse of the former, occasioning a parallel abeyance of the latter, continually comes in, as a sort of episode, which yet the Holy Ghost seems ever to delight in dismissing, that He may return to His joyful strain. In this episode, what is being now transacted, even the 'salvation which is with eternal glory,' of the elect Church, lay hidden from them; and, accordingly, we read of it being revealed to them, 'that not *unto themselves*, *but unto us*, they did minister the things which are now reported unto us, by them that have preached the Gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven.' (1 Peter i. 12.) If it be objected that this reservation from their knowledge of the calling of our dispensation is incompatible with what is expressly stated in the context, namely, that '*they inquired*' concerning it, '*prophesied of the grace*,' and '*ministered the things*' which compose it—all which seems to imply some acquaintance with the subject; it is to be observed, in reply, that these several expressions are plainly put in apposition with verse 11, just considered,—'*searching*,' &c.; and their meaning should be governed by it. Between 'the sufferings and glories' there spoken of, as chronological boundaries or outlines, the present peculiar dispensation was to run its course. These boundaries the prophets saw, and were exercised by inspiration in defining; and so their writings present to us, so to speak, the seed-plot of our dispensation. But the precious seed itself to be sown therein, or rather already deposited from the beginning,—only destined to lie inorganic till the due season of Messiah's rejection by 'His own' would arrive,—this they did not, they could not, recognise. And hence the calling of the Church is denominated 'the mystery which from the beginning of the world had been hid in God.' (Eph. iii. 9.) 'Hid from ages and from generations.' (Col. i. 26.) 'Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men.' (Eph. iii. 5.) 'Kept secret since the world began.'" (Rom. xvi. 25.)

Having thus endeavoured to disabuse my reader's mind of what might otherwise have appeared a clear authority against my alleged silence of the prophets concerning our dispensation, I proceeded to examine in detail several of the quotations therefrom in the New Testament, commonly insisted on as examples of the fact, and as so adduced by the apostles themselves. Amongst these I carefully weighed the import of Isaiah xlix. 6, and its obvious citation in the mouth of Simeon, (Luke ii. 32,) and Paul, (Acts xiii. 47, 48.) The passage

Digitized by Google

itself,* I contended, was the Father's promise to Messiah, languishing after the welfare of Israel, like Jacob after his beloved Rachel, that he should not only achieve this object of his heart in due time, but that he should '*also*' become God's light and salvation universally to the Gentiles. There is not a word said, however, as to the fulfilment of this latter *preceding* the former—the supposition which is necessary to make the passage apply to what is going on now—and the whole context, as may be seen, implies the reverse. Then, as to Simeon's song, in which it is referred to, we are to remember, as I showed in my last, that the advent of Messiah overlooking our dispensation is continually presented in the prophets, as fraught with blessedness to Jew and Gentile; the superiority, however, belonging to the former. What wonder then, when that advent at length took place, that the Spirit which inspired the prophets should have led Simeon, Jewish saint as he was, to hail it in this very twofold aspect, still assigning also the superiority to his own people: "*A* LIGHT *to lighten the Gentiles, and the* GLORY *of thy people Israel.*" Here, as I observed, the *exceeding* lustre which is ascribed to Israel's position, in one clause, is incongruous, if we suppose that *the Gentiles*, mentioned in the other, mean the Church; for to the Church belongs a glory far surpassing Israel's, not inferior to it.

Again, in regard to Paul's allusion to this prophecy in the Acts, I explained it thus: "Paul was now about to turn from the unbelieving Jews, to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. But, against the admissibleness of the latter to the favour of God, the Jewish mind was most strangely prejudiced. Therefore, irrespective of any particular time, or the peculiar calling under our dispensation, it sufficed the apostle to show from the Jews' own Scriptures, that Gentiles were not excluded from the Divine favour. And to this end, his quotation has a manifest appropriateness."

This explanation I applied to another apparently embarrassing quotation from the Prophet *Amos*, as employed in Acts xv. 13—17. I then passed on to the consideration of *Hosea* i. 9, 10, and ii. 23, as quoted in Romans ix. 25, 26: "Looking to the prophecy itself," I said, "we observe a threatened abandonment of Israel, to be succeeded by an equally marked acknowledgment of them again, and in their own land. There is not a syllable in either chapter, so far as their own light shows, concerning *any* calling of the Gentiles. Well—how does the apostle use the reference? In this way. The *nation* of the Jews, he teaches, had been cast off for a season, and an elect remnant of Jews and Gentiles were being called to a new thing. And, with this two-fold event, he admits that the sovereignty of God had to do. Hereupon he supposes an unbelieving Jew to allege against God the indulgence of arbitrary caprice. But to this, he answers, as it were, 'By no means; what, if in this procedure, so obnoxious to you, the Divine purpose be, on the one hand, to manifest his long-suffering, in the case of a degenerate and wicked people, such as Israel; and on the other, to develop his riches of glory (a new dispensation altogether) in the case of the Church? Is not here a wise end assigned for the Divine procedure?' He then goes on to show, that this very procedure was provided for in their own Scriptures. For example, that *Hosea* predicted a period in their history when they should be called '*not* God's people;' and again, a period when they should be called 'His people,' and *thus leaving room in the interval for the present dispensation.*"

The apostle's further citation from Isaiah x. 22, 23; and i. 9, in the same chapter, I similarly noticed, adding, that we had thus a practical illustration of the import of "the searching of the prophets," in 1 Peter i. 11. My words were—"Taking Hosea and Isaiah as representatives of all those 'holy men of old who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,' we see at once how naturally they might have been exercised, as described, over these very passages

* "It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth."

Digitized by Google

of their respective prophecies. In 'the sufferings and glories' of which they testified, involving the fall and rising again of their own people, they perceived, I repeat, the *boundaries* of our dispensation, and were anxious to discern the *filling up*. But this was reserved for another time, and for a special ministry; even that of Paul, 'made a minister to fulfil (πληρῶσαι) the word of God; even the mystery hid from ages and from generations, but now made manifest to his saints.'" (Col. i. 25, 26.)

I lastly considered the series of quotations from the Old Testament, in Romans xv. 9—12; and the substance of what I offered was as follows: "The case of the Church at Rome consisting, as it did, of Jewish and Gentile converts, needed an incentive to brotherly concord. This might have been supplied by the issue of a fresh precept for the occasion; but the Spirit, as he is wont, confines not himself to this, but chooses rather to argue from the Old Testament Scriptures. And, as the most apposite to the purpose, were, of course, those passages which bore on Jewish and Gentile association, it necessarily came to pass that those of a *prophetical* character were adduced; for none other treat of such association. Thus, these particular prophecies come before us. According to them, Messiah is hereafter to unite Jew and Gentile in *the coming dispensation;* and the implication is, that by experimental mutual sympathy in that 'body—the Church,' of which He is the head, He ought to unite them now."

To have had the above inductive argument subjected to the revision of any accurate-minded brother, would, I trust, have been truly grateful to me. But my Reviewer has not favoured me with such. He has merely made dogmatic assertions, setting down a number of texts, some of them the foregoing, and adding that "*no ingenuity can set aside their plain and concurrent testimony.*" Let me, however, profit by him if I can. In my brief digest of Old Testament quotations, it appears, I exhausted not *all* that have an embarrassing aspect on my position, and my Reviewer has supplied my omission.

I turn, then, to the passages in question. And, first, Deut. xxxii. 21, wherein God thus admonishes Israel of the judgment their wickedness would yet bring upon them—"*They have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God; they have provoked me to anger with their vanities; and I will move them to jealousy with those which are not a people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation.*" Of course the import of this is best determined by the context, at least it should be first consulted. The occasion, then, of this threatening, we see in verses 16 and 17. Israel are there contemplated as guilty of grievous apostasy from God, accompanied with idolatry; and this sin, we know, whilst it has characterized them at various periods hitherto, will especially attach to them in the day of their future gathering together in their land. What, accordingly, is the retribution that God determines to visit upon them? It is recounted in verse 20, under the aspect of *privation*—what they shall lose: "I will hide my face from them, I will see what their end shall be;" whilst in verse 21, that under discussion, God goes further, and speaks of his positively espousing the cause of others before their eyes, thus provoking them to jealousy; *and the party thus acknowledged of God, appears from the next verse to be Israel's enemies*, who will be arrayed against them; "for," adds God, "a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell." . . . "I will heap mischiefs upon them."

But, before pressing this inference here, merely suggesting it as the obvious one from the context, let us refer to the collateral evidence of a remarkable passage in the Prophet Isaiah. The faithful Jewish remnant, in the midst of the fierce trials of the latter day, are brought forward thus interceding with the God of their fathers: "Look down from heaven, and behold from the habitation of thy holiness and of thy glory: where is thy zeal and thy strength, the sounding of thy bowels and of thy mercies toward me? are they restrained? Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not: thou, O Lord, art our Father, our redeemer; thy name is

Digitized by Google

from everlasting. O Lord, why hast thou made us to err from thy ways, and hardened our heart from thy fear? Return, for thy servants' sake, the tribes of thine inheritance. The people of thy holiness have possessed it but a little while; our adversaries have trodden down thy sanctuary." (Isaiah lxiii. 15—18.) All these utterances, especially that in the last verse, seem to accord with that period of Jewish history yet future, when Palestine, after being occupied for a season by her children, will be invaded, and overrun by enemies,* and the holy city and temple be desecrated, as is mentioned in Revelation xi. At this crisis, Israel's possession of their long-desired inheritance will have been truly a brief one, and they may well plead the fact—"*The people of thy holiness have possessed it but a little while.*" Moreover, when the temple shall have been, as we read, given into the hands of the Gentiles, who will be in possession of Jerusalem (it may be for the whole period mentioned, "forty and two months,") with what truth may they not sorrowfully add, "*our adversaries have trodden down thy sanctuary?*" But, now following the strain of this lamentation a little further, what do we read in the next verse, in reference to the very adversaries just named? "*We are thine; thou never barest rule over them; they were not called by thy name.*" (Verse 19.) Does not this imply that these "adversaries" are in some way or other patronised by God—*one* element of confirmation of the conclusion suggested by the passage in Deuteronomy; and have we not *another*, in these accents of *awakened jealousy*, as they contemplate the unlooked-for spectacle of a Gentile power thus suffered to lord it over them; as they express it in the Forty-fourth Psalm, (which doubtless points to the same period,) "*Thou hast cast off, and put us to shame; and goest not forth with our armies. Thou makest us to turn back from the enemy: and they which hate us spoil for themselves.*" (Verse 9, 10.)

Again: of the adversaries in question, let us observe, it is emphatically said, "*they were not called by thy name.*" Are not these, then, the same of whom the Lord speaks, in the following chapter, when, noticing the querulous intreaties addressed to Him, he says:† "I am found of them that sought me not; I said, Behold me, behold me, *unto a nation that was not called by my name.*" (Isa. lxv. 1.) The context certainly seems to warrant this identification, and, admitting it, we at once perceive the coherency of the whole passage. It is as if God took up the matter of Israel's jealousy,—his befriending of those adverse to them, and repeating it here, proceeded to account for it. He was now on the side of Gentiles, who, compared with favoured Israel, were wont to be disowned by Him. But why? In order to the chastisement of Israel for their inveterate disobedience and idolatry, of which, hereupon, in the next verse, various instances are specified. This view, it is obvious, gives a unity of import to both passages in Deuteronomy and Isaiah, without involving any reference to our dispensation.

Let us now see if the apostle's quotation of these same passages, in the Epistle to the Romans (wherein, it is remarkable, they are similarly combined), requires us to assign to them another interpretation; for, of course, an inspired comment should possess paramount and final authority with us. The subject, in the treatment of which the apostle is led to make these references, seems very plain. It is the gracious tenor of the Gospel invitation, as expressed in the Old Testament Scriptures, with which the Jews ought to have been acquainted: "*For the Scripture saith, whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.*" (Rom. x. 11.) To this he adds a passing comment, to the effect that even Gentiles are not excluded from the favour of this proclamation. Then he adduces another equally general appeal: "*For whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved.*" (Ver. 13.) From these Scriptures, both referring to a *future* crisis of Jewish history, as may be seen on examination, he proceeds to argue that the name of the Lord must have been widely notified; for otherwise, how could Jew and Gentile indiscriminately call upon

* Ezekiel xxxviii. 8—13.

† The preceding clause, which I have not adduced, "I am sought of them that asked not for me," is perhaps to be referred to Israel, as now seeking to the Lord, after long neglect of Him.

Digitized by Google

him? "*How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things.*" (Ver. 14, 15.) All this the apostle seems to urge, in order to awaken a sense of responsibility in the Jewish mind. He then turns to show from Scripture, how unworthily it was predicted, the mass of the nation would act in the face of that responsibility: "*But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?* (as it is in the margin) *the hearing of us*," *i.e.*, the hearing of the preachers alluded to in the previous chapter of the prophet, and whom the apostle had just contemplated. (Ver. 16.) Thus the apostle had shown, both positively and negatively, from the different receptions that the Gospel—the glad tidings of Messiah's kingdom—was predicted to meet with, that, as he had stated in a foregoing verse, the word of God addressed to faith was the appointed channel of blessing. And he sums up his conclusion thus: "*So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.*" (Ver. 17.)

But this does not satisfy him in his desire to demonstrate the failure in responsibility of his nation, and therefore he continues, "*But I say, have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.*" (Ver. 18.) This is a quotation from the 19th Psalm, which is used by the apostle to express in a forcible way that, like as the very heavens themselves proclaimed the glory of God, so the testimony to his saving truth had gone amongst the Jewish people, and left them without excuse. He then inquires, "*But I say, did not Israel know?*" an inquiry, I submit, which relates not to the doctrine of "righteousness by faith," which the apostle had been inculcating—an antecedent too remote to apply here—but to the fact which he had just brought out, *their revealed disobedience to the Gospel* (ver. 16), *and their consequent incurral of the Divine displeasure;* as though he had said, "Did they not know? were they not forewarned of the judgment which they would bring upon themselves by their disobedience?" And then, to substantiate the allegation thus implied, he proceeds to quote the twofold testimony in question, of Moses and Isaiah; who, both speaking of a Gentile party to be favoured of God in the latter day, instead of Israel, clearly hint at the contemporaneous chastisement of the latter. Thus, the Jews knew that they were prophetically arraigned as provoking God by their disobedience; and being thus admonished, their guilt was the greater in not submitting to the truth when presented to them in the person of Messiah, and by the mouth of his apostles.

I forbear, for brevity's sake, reciting again the exact quotations of the apostle, as they have been already given, and only vary here, as being taken from the Septuagint. But one verse included from Isaiah, to which I had not extended my quotation, requires some notice. The apostle thus introduces it: "But unto Israel he saith, All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people." (Ver. 21.) In characterising Israel after this manner, whilst indicating the Divine favour as resting on their Gentile oppressors, the prophet is denominated "*very bold;*" and certainly, he must have appeared so to Jewish prejudices and self-complacency. But this only served to convict Israel the more clearly of cognizance of the Divine judgment, which could not but attend their provocation.

And, now for the winding up of the apostle's reasoning. Having thus cited a revelation of the future purpose of God, he proceeds to make an application of it to the circumstances existing in his day. Israel had grievously fallen, and God was making their fall the occasion of "salvation to the Gentiles (the Church) to provoke them to jealousy." (Rom. xi. 11.) In fact, God was and is acting upon a principle of his own divine administration contained in the prophecy cited, and so the apostle argues from it. But this is quite compatible with the still suspended fulfilment of such prophecy, as determined by

Digitized by Google

a reference to its context. Indeed, if the prophecy in question touching the Divine favour to Gentiles be supposed in point of strict interpretation to relate to the position now occupied by the Church, this would involve our taking up the sword against Israel, and becoming their adversaries; and perhaps by the Romish Inquisition of old, this was the line of argument adopted to justify their persecution, at various times, of God's ancient people; so dangerous may it prove to mistake the blessed word of God.

I now proceed to say a few words upon Matt. xxi. 43, another text referred to by my reviewer, as adverse to my position, but which upon careful examination offers no difficulty. Its connexion is this: after addressing to the chief priests and Pharisees the parable of the wicked husbandmen, our Lord suggests the application of it to themselves by the inquiry, "*Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner; this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.*" (Ver. 42.) These men, by reason of their authority among the people, were comparable to builders, who when the stone laid in Zion for a foundation, *i.e.*, the Messiah, was set before them, ought to have at once recognised it, and acted accordingly, building their happiness and that of their nation upon it. But, alas! instead of this, they were now rejecting it, fulfilling the prophecy of the 118th Psalm. To this, the Lord calls their attention, and then adds the announcement in question: "*Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.*" Here it is urged, that, in keeping with the alleged tenor of Old Testament prophecy, we have a clear prediction from our Lord's own lips, of the setting aside of the Jews, and the introduction of the Church into their place. But is it so?

In the first place, touching the phrase, "*the kingdom of God,*" what was it designed to import to Jewish ears? Was it not the hope of the Jewish nation,—*the earthly kingdom*, of which they were advertised by the mouths of all their prophets, and which our Lord came to establish in righteousness, *if they would?* When, therefore, the Lord speaks of this kingdom being to be taken from them and given to *others*, surely we ought to determine the latter to mean those who are yet to be installed into the kingdom,—even that future generation of the Jewish people, of whom it is said, "they shall be all righteous," in whose hearts the Divine law shall be written, and who will yet show forth God's praises throughout the earth. Nor does it conflict with this, that they are termed *a nation*, as though this term belonged only to Gentiles, for it is sometimes used to denote the Jews themselves. (John xi. 48—52; Acts x. 22; xxiv. 17.)

Then, secondly, of what Gentile nation can it be affirmed, that they "*bring forth the fruits thereof,*" *i.e.*, of the kingdom of God? Even if the visible Church be understood as the nation intended, how is the difficulty lessened? Is not the Church as a visible body, as deficient in fruit unto God, yea, as corrupt as the Jewish community formerly?

Having written thus far, I find it impracticable, as I had hoped, when I commenced, to finish the subject in my present letter. With your permission, therefore, I shall reserve what remains for your next Number. Meanwhile, my prayer for myself and your readers is, that God may give us grace to *unlearn* more and more what is merely of man, that we may *learn of Him*. I am persuaded, every real student of the Word, and, especially, the prophetic Scriptures, has much of the former humbling process to go through.

I remain, yours, &c.,

JAMES KELLY.

Churton House, Belgrave-road, August 30, 1849.

Digitized by Google

THE MEETING-PLACE.

"The ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads."—Isaiah xxxv. 10.

I.

WHERE the faded flower shall freshen,—
Freshen never more to fade;
Where the shaded sky shall brighten,—
Brighten never more to shade:
Where the sun-blaze never scorches;
Where the star-beams cease to chill;
Where no tempest stirs the echoes
Of the wood, or wave, or hill:
Where the morn shall wake in gladness,
And the noon the joy prolong,
Where the daylight dies in fragrance,
'Mid the burst of holy song.
Brother, we shall meet and rest
'Mid the holy and the blest!

II.

Where no shadow shall bewilder,
Where life's vain parade is o'er,
Where the sleep of sin is broken,
And the dreamer dreams no more:
Where the bond is never severed;—
Partings, claspings, sob and moan,
Midnight waking, twilight weeping,
Heavy noontide,—all are done.
Where the child has found its mother,
Where the mother finds the child,
Where dear families are gathered,
That were scattered on the wild.
Brother, we shall meet and rest
'Mid the holy and the blest!

III.

Where the hidden wound is healed,
Where the blighted life re-blooms,
Where the smitten heart the freshness
Of its buoyant youth resumes.
Where the love that here we lavish
On the withering leaves of time,
Shall have fadeless flowers to fix on
In an ever spring-bright clime.

Digitized by Google

Where we find the joy of loving,
  As we never loved before,—
Loving on, unchilled, unhindered,
  Loving once and evermore.
    Brother, we shall meet and rest,
    'Mid the holy and the blest!

IV.

Where a blasted world shall brighten
  Underneath a bluer sphere,
And a softer, gentler sunshine
  Shed its healing splendour here.
Where earth's barren vales shall blossom,
  Putting on their robe of green,
And a purer, fairer Eden
  Be where only wastes have been.
Where a King in kingly glory,
  Such as earth has never known,
Shall assume the righteous sceptre,
  Claim and wear the holy crown.
    Brother, we shall meet and rest,
    'Mid the holy and the blest!

NOTICE.

Several valuable communications have been deferred from over-press of matter. In reviewing books, we have, of course, often occasion to dissent from the opinions stated in them. This leads some to send us communications in defence of the views impugned. These, in general, we must decline to insert,—save in special circumstances, as they would occupy far more space than we can afford.

All readers of the Journal are most earnestly besought to give it room in their prayers; that by means of it God may be honoured and his truth advanced; also, that it may be conducted in faith and love, with sobriety of judgment and discernment of the truth, in nothing carried away into error or hasty speech, or sharp unbrotherly disputation.

Macintosh, Printer, Great New-street, London.

Digitized by Google

GENERAL INDEX.

American writers on prophecy, 135
Antichrist, destruction of, 224
Apocalypse, general scope of, 39
" Old and New Testament, 113
" Fulfilled or unfulfilled, 216
" Greek text of, 234
Apostolicity of Chiliasm, 105

Babylon, 5
Balaam, prophecies of, 265
Belshazzar, 540
Birks' Mystery of Providence, 287
" Review of ditto, 210
Blessings, prophetic, of Jacob and Moses, 353
Brainerd, 524
Brown, D., 527, 530
Bunyan, his idea of the Millennium, 20

Capadose, Dr., speech of, 94
Cecil, 517
Chalmers, Dr., 531
Characteristics of the last days, 153
Church saved by hope, 517
Chiliasm, apostolicity of, 153
" ditto, 445
" in the 17th century, 444
Church of Christ, interpreter of God's ways, 7
Coleridge, 531
Coming, the, of Elias, 332
Connexion with the future, 1
Correspondence, answer to, 226
" ditto, 231
Correspondents, A Learner, 228
" Barker, W. G., 222
" Elliott, E. B., 351, 581
" Earnest Inquirer, 351
Correspondents, Frere, J. H., 101
" Faber, G. S., 213
" Girdlestone, H., 346
" Gurney, J. P., 345
" J. G., 341
" Kelly, James, 216, 335, 457, 587
" Ogilvy, George, 449
" Ditto, 454
" Rees, Arthur A., 466
" Student of prophecy, 349
" Verax, 349
" W. W., 228
" W. H., 230
" W., 462
" W. J. E., 464
" Walker, G. J., 350
" Ditto, 465
" Young student of Prophecy, 231
" X. Z., 467
Creation, redemption of, 528
Crownless king of the last days, 72

Darius, 543
David, throne of, 496
Davidson, 469, 475, 480, 484
Destruction of Antichrist, 244
Difficulties, treatment of, 171
Disorganization, sign of, 57
Dispensation of the fulness of time, 412
Dispersion, sign of, 59
Dominion of the Second Adam, 286

Enoch and Elijah, as the two witnesses, 4
Extracts from Apocalyptic Cabbala, 446
" Bunyan, 334
" Capadose, Dr., 94

Digitized by Google

Extracts from Chillingworth, 445
" Dead saints at Christ's appearing, 333
" Foster's Life, 212
" Future Conversion of the Jews, 334
" Gess's Revelation of God, 333
" Hall's Works, 333
" Ditto, 334
" Hort on the Millennium, 112
" Israel's Redemption, 89
" Luther's Works, 445
" Mill's Prolegomena, 445
" Millennium, Doctrine of, 333
" Mount of Spirits, 93
" Mystery of Israel's Salvation, 334
" Neander's Church History, 333
" Ditto, 445
" Olshausen on the Gospels, 332
" Postponement of the Advent, 445
" Temple in Ezekiel, 333
" Voice of Israel, 137
" Warning and Expostulation, 211
" Woodrow's Analecta, 444
" Whitby's Treatise on Tradition, 333
Extreme Futurism, difficulties of, 142

Fair dealing with the Scriptures, 61
First resurrection, 73
French Revolution of 1848, 73
Frere's Continental Revolution, 69
Futurism, difficulties of, 142
Future, our connexion with, 1
" the inheritance of the Church, 1
" the province of the world, 1

Gebelin, De, 539
God's theory of the world, 10
" diverse from man's, 14
Gospels, origin of, 469
Greek text of Apocalypse, 234
Greek language spoken in Galilee, 477, 479
Greswell, 471

Harmonies of Genesis and Revelation, 373
Horne's Introduction, 475
Hug, 471, 477

Individualism, sign of, 58
Intercession of Christ, 30
Intermediate state, 176
Interpretation of Scripture, 64
Insubordination, sign of, 59

Judges, Old Testament, 506
Judgment to come, 505, 516

Letter to an inquirer, 61
" ditto, 168
" on interpretation, 64
" Line of proof, 168
" Treatment of difficulties, 171
" Prejudices, 550
" Misapprehensions, 553

Manchester, Duke of, 486, 487
Marsh, Bishop, 470, 481

Nabonadius, 547
Nebuchadnezzar, successors of, 539
Neànder, 473
Norton, 474
Notes on Scripture—
" Genesis ix. 11, 304
" Judges iv. 5, 425
" Job xiv. 11, 15, 74
" Psalm lxviii. 35, 430
" Proverbs xxi. 16, 76
" 21, 175
" Isaiah xxiv. 6, 433
" Haggai ii. 23, 175
" John x. 30, 40, 74
" xii. 31, 32, 82
" Acts xv. 14, 17, 309
" 1 Corinthians xv. 24, 28, 85
" 2 Corinthians v., 176
" Galatians iv. 21, 31, 189
" Philippians iii. 12, 14, 434
" 1 Thess. v. 5, 192
" Hebrews ii. 15, 87
" xi. 39, 40, 88
" Revelation iii. 28, 434
" xviii., 312
" xxii. 14, 316

Digitized by Google

Objections and difficulties urged against Millenarianism, 30

Poetry—The Change, 104
" Passing Through, 232
" A Little While, 351
" The Night and Morning, 463
" The Meeting Place, 595
Practical word for the times, 430
Proofs of Millenarianism, &c., 147
Prophecy, unfulfilled, how to be studied, 16
" American writers on, 135
Prophecies of Balaam, 265

Reviews—Atlas of Prophecy, 440
" Barrister's Thoughts on Prophecy, 576
" Beeston'sGenealogies, 443
" Beith's Letters, 329
" Birks' Mystery of Providence, 210
" Bowen's Things to Come, 443
" Burchell's Midnight Cry, 325
" Burder's Notes, 437
" Carlile's First and Second Advent, 198
" Clemens on the Spiritual Reign, 575
" Chalmers' Scripture Readings, 70
" Horæ Biblicæ Sab., 204
" Sermons, 326
" Institutes, 442
" Chiliast, 443
" Christianity of Abraham, 441
" Conder's Harmony of History, 318
" Craik's Translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 210
" Dallas's Revelation Reading, 208
" Guide to the Epistles of St. Paul, 436
" Darby's Letter on the Lord's Humanity, 209
" Examination, 71
" Denny's Charts, 328
" Hymns, 330
" First Resurrection, &c., 73
Reviews—Fletcher's Crownless King, 72
" Fleming's Rise and Fall of the Papacy, 320
" Frere's Continental Revolution, 69
" Gaussen's ItisWritten, 203
" Gleanings from many Fields, 328
" Guide to Greek Testament, 441
" Hislop's Red Republic, 435
" Hoare's Harmony of Apocalypse, 324
" Hymns and Thoughts for the Sick and Lonely, 328
" Introduction to Canticles, 209
" Book of Job, 436
" and Chart of Sacred History, 437
" Italy and the Gospel, 328
" Keith's Evidence of Prophecy, 192
" Kelly's Subjects Connected with Prophecy, 317
" Apocalypse Interpreted, 438
" England'sFast, 579
" Knight's Eighth King of Babylon, 210
" Last Vials, 208
" Lorimer's Christian Loyalty, 579
" Lowe's History of the Cross, 442
" Maitland's Apostles' School, 574
" Mansford's Sixth Seal and Seventh Vial, 72
" Macdonald's Thoughts on Genesis, 205
" Life of, 327
" Maranatha, 576
" Miller, H., Footprints of the Creator, 580
" M'Farlane's Mountains of the Bible, 319
" M'Kenzie on the Prophecy of Obadiah, 441
" Meditations on Song of Solomon, 330
" Mudge's Missions, 318
" Newton's Aids to Prophetic Inquiry, 210

Digitized by Google

Reviews—Number of the Beast, 437
" Paley's Evidences, 210
" Parrot's Marianne the Jew, 578
" Past Fulfilment of Prophecy a Guide to the Future, 437
" Politics for the People, 74
" Priest upon his Throne, 442
" Rabett on the Name of the Beast, 435
" Retrospect, 318
" Rhind's Reign of Christ, 444
" Rogers' Jesus Comes, and Quickly, 328
" Rutherford's Letters, 73
" Seventh Vial, 207
" Ditto, 325
" Seymour's Mornings among the Jesuits, 441
" Smith's French Revolution, 73
" Tait's Christian Indeed, 319
" Theological Journal, 73
" Trench's Latin Hymns, 443
" Tweedie's Life of M'Donald, 327
" Wordsworth's Lectures, 324
" Word in Season, 210

Schleiermacher, 473
Schutte, Rutger, 562
Scope of the Apocalypse, 38
Seven Trumpets, 287
Shiloh, the King of Zion, 122
Signs, 56
Sign of Disorganization, 57
" Dispersion, 59
" Individualism, 58
" Insubordination, 59
" New coin, 579
Sixth and Seventh Seal, 72
State, intermediate, 176
Stewart (Moses), 475, 476

Testament, Old and New, Apocalypse, 113
Testimonies to Chiliasm, 110
Theological and Literary Journal, 73
Thief, figure of, why used by our Lord, 331

Unfulfilled prophecy, how to be studied, 16
Unproved statements to be resisted, 6

Wesley's Millenarianism, 95
What occasioned thoughts of Antichrist, 333
Why our Lord uses the figure of a thief, 331

Digitized by Google

INDEX OF SCRIPTURES.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
GENESIS.		
i.		375
	14	228
	26, 28	387
ix.	11	304
	12, 17	266
xxi.		355
xxxv.	17, 18	354
xlix.		353, 358, 370
EXODUS.		
xvii.		359
xxviii.	21	372
xxx.	8, 9	34
LEVITICUS.		
xvi.	11, 14	31
NUMBERS.		
i.	4, 7, 16	125
x.	14	361
xvi.	30, 33	178
xx.	13	359
xxii.		265, 278
xxiii.		268, 271
xxiv.		272, 276
xxv.	11, 13	360
xxix.	7, 11	37
xxxi.	16	277
xxxii.		365
xxxiv.	5	350
DEUTERONOMY.		
xxxii.	8	269, 459, 461
	21, 22	
		43, 466, 178
xxxiii.		353, 358, 372
JOSHUA.		
i.	8	280
xxii.	1—6	365
JUDGES.		
iv.		425
v.		356, 425
I SAMUEL.		
ii.	10	283
xv.	8, 6	273, 276
II SAMUEL.		
xv.	12	285
xxiii.	1—4	410
I KINGS.		
iv.	20, 25	361
vi.	7	186
xviii.	31	79
II KINGS.		
ii.	1—11	5
viii.		456
I CHRONICLES.		
iv.	43	276
v.	18, 22	365
xii.	8	365
	40	363
xvi.	15	307
II CHRONICLES.		
xx.		276
xxix.	15	43
NEHEMIAH.		
ii.	8	179
ESTHER.		
iii.	1	273
JOB.		
iv.	8	270
xiv.	11—15	74
xix.	25	96, 527
xxxviii.	22, 23	305
PSALMS.		
i.		279, 284, 467
ii.		281, 285
iii.		286
iv.		556
v.		558
vi.		560
vii.	11, 12	308
viii.		387
ix.	17	178
xi.	6	308
xvi.		367, 180, 178, 465
xxii.		19, 286, 465
xxiv.		279
xxxi.	20	310
xlvi.	8, 9	400
l.	6	308
lviii.		278
lx.		275
lxviii.		356, 273, 430
lxix.	21	19
lxxii.		84, 139, 361, 408
lxxv.	8	316
lxxviii.	59—71	123
lxxxiii.	1—5	427, 276
lxxxvi.	13	178
lxxxviii.		178, 179
xcii.	7	263
xciv.	15	83
xcvi.	11—13	397
xcviii.		409
	7, 8, 9	67
civ.	16	273
cvi.	16	359
	40, 45	271
cix.		246
cx.	1	260
	1, 2	134
	3	427
cxxxii.	17	129
cxl.	5	307
cxli.	2	34
cxlv.	19	183
cxlvi.	4	181
PROVERBS.		
i.	23—26	283
ii.	18, 21, 22	76
ix.	18	76
	19	178
xii.	18	358
xv.	24	178
xxi.	16	76

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
xxi.	21	175
xxx.	4	78
xxxi.	2	282

ECCLESIASTES.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
ii.	5	179
xii.	7	181

SONG OF SOLOMON.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
ii.	17	538
iv.	13	179
vi.	10	190

ISAIAH.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
ii.	1, 5	222
	3	399
	4	401
	12	227
	12	137
	17	96
iv.	3	428
	5, 6	310
vi.	1	118
viii.		496—594
ix.		137
	6	123
	6, 7	361
x.	5	276
xi.		137
	1	129
	1, 5	408
	1, 2, 5, 6, 9	458
	6, 9	268, 398, 447
	11, 16	138
xiii.	6—9	227
	17, 20	351
xiv.	29	156
xvii.	14	468
xix.	23, 25	138
xxiv.		215
	21, 23	25
	23	271
xxv.	6	118, 433, 447
	7	46
	8	25, 454
	9	446
xxvi.	14	76
	19	258
	19, 20, 21	25
	21	257
xxvii.	1	257
	6	25
xxx.	26	91
xxxi.	4	134
xxxii.	1, 2	311
	14	196
	20	273
xxxiv.		275
	5	275
xxxv.		67
xli.	23	218
xlii.	1, 3	83
	13	316
xliv.	4	399
xlviii.	1	273
xlix.	6	45, 134, 137
	6, 8	361
	16, 17	140
	23	96
liii.		66
liv.	1	136
	1, 3	191
	9	305
lv.	1	135, 362
	12, 13	397
lix.		137
	19	97
lx.	2	91
	13	97
	14	403
	21	269
lxi.	9	137
lxiii.	1	311
	1, 4	134
	1, 6	275
lxv.		145, 215, 449
	1	466
	17	22, 97, 395
	17—25	93, 396
	19—25	23
	18	348
	20	347, 452
	20, 22	398
	21, 23, 24	401
	25	268
lxvi.	15—23	
	23,	347, 348, 395, 447
	24	188

JEREMIAH.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
ii.	21	314
iv.	17	84
vii.	12	123
xiv.	19, 22	212
xv.	19, 20	138
xvii.	8	280
xxi.	25	295
xxii.	11	128
	24, 29, 30	131
	30	127
xxiii.	5	458
	5, 8	138
xxv.	1	119
xxx.	5—11	26
	7	27
xxxi.		269
	27, 30	452
	31, 34	136
	38	91
xxxiii.	9	137
xxxiii.	14, 17	131
	19, 26	140
xlviii.	45	275
xlix.	33	196
l.	20	271
	39	351
	44	134
li.	7	313
	26, 27	351
	45	315
lii.	31	129

LAMENTATIONS.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
i.	1, 2	68

EZEKIEL.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
i.	1	119
ii.	1, 2, 25, 26, 28	120
	28	305
iii.	1, 3	117
viii.	1	120
	11, 12	289
ix.	4	116
x.	2, 12	120
xvi.		117
xvii.	5, 8	273
xix.	10	273
xx.	1	120
xxi.	25, 27	131
xxiii.		117
	22—29	120
xxiv.	1	120
xxvi.	1	120
	16, 17	118
xxix.	1	120
	21	129
xxxi.	1	120
	7	273
	16	179
xxxii.	1	120
xxxiv.	23, 24	403
	27	397
xxxvi.	36	310
xxxvii.		118
	12, 13	91
	20, 25, 28	451
	21, 28	138
	24	97
	27	120
xxxviii.	22	453
xxxix.	6	118
	17	403
	29	98
xl.		91
	1	120, 227
	2	90, 120
	41	91
xli.	16, 17, 21	91
xliv.	2, 4	464
	25	452

Digitized by Google

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
xlv.	1—7	90
xlvii.	1, 8, 9, 12	91
	12	121
xlviii.	35	121, 464

DANIEL.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
ii.	.	98
	35	280
	44	90
vii.	.	426
	9, 10, 11	259
	9, 13	213
	13	21
	14	261
	14, 22, 27	90, 139
	18	142
viii.	13	454
ix.	2, 3	218
	25	457
xi.	5, 30	277
	41	275
xii.	.	98
	1, 2	26, 27
	2	188, 261
	13	75, 176

HOSEA.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
i.	7	79
v.	15	27
vi.	1, 2, 3	28
xi.	8, 9	140
	10	134
xii.	4	79
xiii.	6, 8	426
	7, 8	134
	14	178
	15	369

JOEL.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
i.	2	227
ii.	22	397
	28, 29	399
iii.	18	350

AMOS.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
ix.	11, 12	309, 465

OBADIAH.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
	18, 19	309
	19, 21	310

JONAH.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
ii.	9	285
iv.	11	266

MICAH.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
iv.	7, 8	460
v.	4	408
	8	271
vi.	5	273
vii.	14	369
	15, 20	140

HABAKKUK.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
iii.	3	356
	3, 6	312

HAGGAI.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
i.	1	120
ii.	1	120
	6, 7, 21, 22	134
	21, 23	132
	23	175

ZECHARIAH.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
i.	1	120
iii.	8	132
	9, 10	138
vi.	11, 13	132
	11	36
vii.	1	120
viii.	4	452, 453
ix.	1	568
xii.	9, 10	403
	10	28, 462
xiv.	.	28, 98, 139, 159, 402, 463
	2, 3, 4, 5	28
	9	403
	10, 11	453
	16, 17	464
	16, 19	452
	16	311, 399

MALACHI.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
ii.	5, 6	360
iii.	18	189
iv.	5	332

ST. MATTHEW.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
ii.	14, 15	571
	17, 18	500, 572
iii.	12	280
v.	6	183
vii.	9, 11	465
	23	280
ix.	16	331
x.	5, 6	137
	28	178
xi.	14	332
	28	569
xii.	29	331
xiii.	.	428
	41, 42	160
	55	130
xvi.	18	182
xvii.	11	223
xix.	28	36, 137, 407
xx.	25	341
xxi.	43	43
xxiii.	38	27
xxiv.	14	229
	20	227
	21	262
	21, 29	27
	27	99
	30	50, 260
	43	331
	46	184
xxv.	.	204
	12	280
	31	36
	31, 46	460
	41, 46	423
xxvi.	29	90, 448
xxvii.	43	286

ST. MARK.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
ix.	31	18
xiv.	25	90
xv.	40	130

ST. LUKE.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
i.	8, 11	34
	30, 33	451
	32	139
	32, 33	271
	32, 33, 70, 74	137
	59	227
	70, 75	364
ii.	32	46
viii.	20	227
xi.	21	331
	23	179
xii.	9, 10, 47, 48	332
	14	458
	32	331
	37, 40	331
xiii.	27	280
xiv.	14	91
	15	90
xvi.	22, 30	179
xvii.	26, 30	228
xviii.	1—8	522
xix.	17, 19	92
xx.	35, 36	91
xxi.	23, 24	262
	24, 27	158
xxii.	16, 18	90
	28	90
xxiii.	43	179
xxiv.	42, 43	90
	44	45

ST. JOHN.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
i.	1	79
	18	282
iv.	21	115
	23	187
v.	23	282

Digitized by Google

Chapter. Verse. Page.
vi. 39—45 . 91
39, 40, 44, 54 . 74
vii. 7 . 286
37 . 227
46 . 77
viii. 56 . 364
41, 58, 59 . 77
ix. 16, 29 . 80
x. 16 . 465
30, 31, 40 . 77
xi. 24 . 74
xii. 31, 32 . 82
xiii. 36 . 182
xvii. 4 . 281
22, 24 . 182
xix. 25 . 130
xxi. 20, 21, 22, 23 . 249

ACTS.

i. 6 . 46, 47
11 . 446
ii. 27 . 178
30 . 137
iii. 19 . 406
20, 21 . 231
21 . 137, 139, 446
iv. 23 . 282
vii. 53 . 356
ix. 15 . 137
x. 41 . 90
43 . 45
xii. 15 . 183
xiii. 27, 29, 32, 40 . 45
33 . 281, 283, 284
47 . 46
xv. 14—17 138, 309, 465
15, 17 . 46
xvii. 2, 3, 11 . 46
xviii. 28 . 46
xxiv. 14 . 46
xxvi. 6, 22 . 46
7 . 353
xxviii. 23 . 46
25, 28 . 218

ROMANS.

i. 3 . 283
18 . 265
ii. 5 . 228
7 . 175
iii. 1, 3 . 137
iv. 13 . 92
19, 21 . 218
vii. 22 . 180
viii. . 447, 525
10 . 183
11 . 460

Chapter. Verse. Page.
viii. 16, 35, 37 . 187
19, 23 . 406
23, 26 . 162
24 . 517
ix. 1, 4 . 140
4 . 137
21, 25 . 43
x. 19, 20 . 466
xi. . 137, 402
1, 2 . 140
1, 26, 27, 29 137
11, 15 . 43
12, 15 . 460
15, 25, 26 . 28
25 . 137
29 . 270
xii. 23 . 183
xv. 9, 12 . 465
10, 12 . 137
xvi. 20 . 460
26 . 45

I CORINTHIANS.

i. 5, 8 . 228
ii. 3 . 282
iii. 13 . 55, 225
iv. 3 . 225, 228
vii. 29 . 351
ix. 17 . 413
x. 1, 4, 11 . 353
xi. 20 . 55, 464
32 . 268
xii. 28, 29 . 45
xv. 3, 24, 28 . 85, 562
22 . 393, 444
27, 28 . 563
43 . 175
44, 45, 46 . 185
45, 53 . 184
54 . 24, 259
55 . 178
58 . 188

II CORINTHIANS.

i. 14 . 228
iv. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 . 180
16, 17, 18 . 181
v. . 176—188
vi. 2 . 228
17 . 315
vii. 10 . 268
x. 4 . 186

GALATIANS.

i. 12, 17 . 44, 48
19 . 130
ii. 2 . 105
12, 15 . 137
iii. 19 . 356
29 . 191

Chapter. Verse. Page.
iv. 4 . 81
7, 30 . 191
21, 31 . 189
22, 31 . 355
iv. 24, 25, 26, 27 . 190
28, 29 . 191

EPHESIANS.

i. 3, 4 . 461
9, 10 . 392, 413
10 . 414
13, 14, 19, 23 . 392, 393
17 . 48
17, 18 . 46
ii. 2 . 266
10 . 186
10, 12 . 266
iii. 2 . 413
5 . 44
15 . 343
16 . 180
iv. 4, 6 . 353
8 . 90
9 . 179
11 . 45
30 . 228
vi. 5 . 282

PHILIPPIANS.

i. 23 . 184
ii. 8, 9 . 90, 281
12, 14 . 434
13 . 282
iii. 9 . 184
13 . 91
21 . 90, 186

COLOSSIANS.

i. 10 . 188
12 . 187
ii. 10, 15 . 90
iii. 15, 17 . 367

I THESSALONIANS.

i. 10 . 220, 465
ii. 19 . 251
iii. 13 . 91, 251
iv. 7 . 104
13 . 448
14 . 91
15 . 251
16, 17 . 446
17 . 177, 266, 460
v. 1 . 46
2, 4, 5 . 192
21 . 229
23 . 251

Digitized by Google

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.

II THESSALONIANS.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
i.	7, 8	258
	7, 10	229
	8	349
ii.		203, 246
	1	251
	3, 8	229, 254
	7, 8	224
	8	248, 262
	9, 10	430

I TIMOTHY.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
iii.	15	464
	16	54
vi.	14	251

II TIMOTHY.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
i.	10	252
iii.	1	162
	1, 13	151
iv.	1	151, 252, 505
	1—8	252

TITUS.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
ii.	13	252

HEBREWS.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
i.	2	148
	3	90
ii.	5	390
	8	90
	15	87, 179
iii.	8	227
v.	7	227
	8, 9	370
vii.	17, 25	32
	24, 25	31
	27	34
viii.	1	31, 90
ix.	11	31, 183
	12	33, 34
	28	99
x.	1, 7	81
	10	34
	12, 13	90
	27	163
xi.	5	188
	7	218
	10	91
	12	190
	13	364
	39, 40	88
xii.	2	90
	18, 24	93
	22	190
	22, 24	406
	26, 28	15
	28	188

JAMES.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
i.	9	163
	11	266
	20	358
v.	5	227

I PETER.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
i.	3, 4	460
	8	187
	11	44
	12	278
	20	148
ii.	5, 9	360
	9	361
	11, 17	232
	12	227
	22	281
iii.	4	347

II PETER.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
i.	4, 19	218
	14	181
	19	21
	20	278
ii.	16	265
	17	232
iii.		346, 213, 449
	3	280
	6, 7, 12, 13	395
	7, 10, 13	348
	8	204
	8, 9	316
	10	331
	10, 13	22
	12, 13	446, 448
	13	347

I JOHN.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
ii.	16	331
	18	147
	28	184
iii.	1	191
	2	83
iv.	17	227

JUDE.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
	10, 11, 12	266
	11, 28	268
	24	86

REVELATION.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
i.	1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10	240
	2, 9	47, 48, 49
	4	235, 236
	5	100, 236
	5, 7	462
	6	236, 360
	7	28, 258
	7, 8	50
i.	9, 10	120
	10	56, 119, 228, 464
	11	241
	12	235
	19	225
ii.	2, 7, 10	235
	2, 13	237
	7	146, 463
	9, 20	462
	14	277
	26	90
	27	282
iii.	3	331
	12	190, 235
	18	184
	21	36, 90, 523
	28	434
iv.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6	120
	2	54
	3	305
	4	237
v.	5	134, 361
	10	92, 100, 241, 404
	13	378
vi.	1	241
	10	522
	11	90
	14	378
	16, 17	284
	17	280
vii.	1	102
	3	116
	9	235
viii.	1	102
	3	32
	5	120
	7	241
	9	235
ix.	13	241
	14	235
	19	241
x.	1	102
	3	134, 237
	9	117
xi.		139, 218, 462, 463
	3	4
	6	223
	7	330
	8	241
	9, 10	466
	15	102
	15, 17	90
	15, 18	138
xii.	3, 9	330
	6	466
	17	47, 49
xiii.		341
	1	242, 330

Digitized by Google

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
xiii.	3	237
	5	330
xiv.	5, 8	242
	6, 9	237
	8	313
	12	235
	18, 19	314
	19, 20	135
xvi.	3, 7	242
	12, 13, 14	426
	14	227
	15	163, 184, 331
	19	316
xvii.	1	102
	3	237
	4	235
	5, 18	351
	8	242, 330
	11	345
	12, 13	427
	16	120
xviii.	1, 21	312
	5	242
	10, 19	118
	12	237
xix.		178
	3, 4, 6	462
	9	103
xix.	10	103
	11	194
	11, 21	213
	15	282
	16	135
	20	178
xx.		380, 424
	1	178
	1, 6	139
	2	237
	3, 7, 9	452
	4	49, 90
	4, 6	361
	4, 6, 7, 10	446
	5	76, 467
	5, 6	448, 452
	6	452
	7, 10	449
	7, 10, 11, 13	453
	9	118
	12	225
	15	178
	16	462
xxi.	1	347
	1, 3	308
	1, 4, 5, 8	453
	1, 5	395
	1, 9	452
xxi.	2	24, 190
	3, 4, 5, 6	375
	3, 6, 24, 27	463
	3, 10	120
	4	454
	5	103, 350
	7	243
	9	102
	10	90
	12	237, 355
	12, 18—25	91
	23	377
	24	139
	24	399
	26	399
xxii.		147
	1, 2	448
	1, 2, 3, 5	91
	2	139, 279, 399
	2, 3	121
	3	463
	5	361
	6	103
	7	284
	8	103
	14	316
	14, 19, 24	243
	20	439

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google